1992

Helping first-year college students climb the academic ladder: Report of a national survey of freshman seminar programming in American higher education

Betsy Overman Barefoot
College of William & Mary - School of Education

Order Number 9226630

Helping first-year college students climb the academic ladder: Report of a national survey of freshman seminar programming in American higher education

Barefoot, Betsy Overman, Ed.D.

The College of William and Mary, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

HELPING FIRST-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS CLIMB THE ACADEMIC LADDER: REPORT OF A NATIONAL SURVEY OF FRESHMAN SEMINAR PROGRAMMING IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Education

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Betsy Overman Barefoot

April 1992

HELPING FIRST-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS
CLIMB THE ACADEMIC LADDER:
REPORT OF A NATIONAL SURVEY OF
FRESHMAN SEMINAR PROGRAMMING
IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Betsy Overman Barefoot

Approved April 1992 by

Roger G. Baldwin, Ph.D.
Chair of Doctoral Committee

John R. Thelin, Ph.D.

James Yankovich, Ph.D.

Charles H. Witten, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A project of this magnitude requires the participation and support of numbers of individuals. I have been fortunate to have the willing and cheerful support of a number of colleagues at the University of South Carolina, especially within the University 101 office.

Sincere thanks first go to John Gardner, Director of University 101 at the University of South Carolina, whose vision and leadership on behalf of the nation's freshmen have served as a catalyst for the development and implementation of a variety of curricular and co-curricular programs on American campuses to improve the freshman year experience. Without John's support and guidance during all phases of this undertaking, it would not have been possible.

Paul and Dorothy Fidler, who performed data analysis for the first national survey of freshman seminar programming, provided assistance with designing and refining the survey instrument. Vicky Howell, Penny Smoak, and Rachel Few-Stokes, staff members in the University 101 office, and my own college-age sons, Tom and Andrew Barefoot, willingly entered volumes of data during their spare time.

Each of the members of my committee provided me prompt and essential feedback on the study in progress. Special thanks go to Roger Baldwin, my chair, for remaining calm and always supportive, and to Charles Witten for his eagle eye, his demand for perfection, and his incomparable knowledge of the APA Style Manual.

And last, but certainly not least, my sincerest thanks go first to Mary Hendrix whose expert typing skills and friendship made the process of assembling 38 statistical tables more bearable and also to John Lane of the University of South Carolina's Computer Center who was somehow able to make data analysis both meaningful and fun.

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

LIST OF TABLES - Continued

HELPING FIRST-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS
CLIMB THE ACADEMIC LADDER:
REPORT OF A NATIONAL SURVEY OF FRESHMAN SEMINAR
PROGRAMMING IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

Since 1980, many American colleges and universities have placed a substantial, if not primary, focus on the needs of their newest initiates--college freshmen. A number of converging circumstances, both internal and external to the campus, have brought about this phenomenon. These circumstances include the following:

1. the shrinking pool of traditional-aged, college-bound students;
2. the alarming college dropout rate which is at its peak during the freshman year;
3. the influx of an increasingly diverse student population, both in terms of ethnicity and academic preparation;
4. the genuine concern of faculty, staff, and administrators for the academic and social well-being of first-year students.

These concerns and others are requiring that campuses seek innovative ways to meet more adequately the needs of freshmen. Increasingly, colleges and universities are discovering that a flexible and effective way by which to address these many problems is the creation of a special course for freshmen called a "freshman seminar."

By analyzing responses to a "National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming," mailed in September of 1991 to all regionally accredited

two- and four-year American colleges and universities with over 100 students (N = 2460), this study investigated the nature and current number of freshman seminars with respect to the five most common forms of this course--the extended orientation seminar, the academic seminar with common content across sections, the academic seminar with content that varies by section, the professional seminar, and the basic study skills seminar.

Similarities and differences between seminar types were reported in terms of goals, content, structure, instructors, instructional activities, instructor training, measured outcomes, administration, longevity, the function of academic advising, and overall campus support. In addition, this study investigated and reported the relationship of institutional characteristics such as Carnegie classification, selectivity, size, and ethnic diversity to the type of freshman seminar offered by a particular campus. Through a comprehensive analysis of survey responses, the freshman seminar was given an overall definition as a course designed to enhance the academic and/or social integration of first-year students through a variety of content and process elements.

Study findings indicated that freshman seminars are currently offered at approximately two-thirds of American colleges and universities. The most common manifestation of freshman seminar programming is the extended orientation seminar. Such seminars account for over 70% of all freshman seminars nationwide.

Participants in many freshman seminars reported have higher retention and graduation rates than non-participants. In addition, the freshman seminar has been positively correlated with increased levels of out-of-class interaction with faculty, increased student involvement in

campus activities, and increased student use of campus services. Because of their documented success in meeting various campus-specific objectives, most freshman seminars are reported to enjoy strong overall support from campus faculty, administrators, and students.

HELPING FIRST-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS CLIMB THE ACADEMIC LADDER: REPORT OF A NATIONAL SURVEY OF FRESHMAN SEMINAR PROGRAMMING IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

CHAPTER 1

Nature and Significance of the Study

Introduction

Within the college experience, the freshman year lays the groundwork for subsequent social adjustment and academic success. Personal recollections of generations of college students as well as student retention research (Astin, 1977a, 1977b; Noel, Levitz, & Saluri, 1985; Pantages & Creedon, 1978; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1977; Tinto, 1985) provide overwhelming evidence that the freshman year is the critical juncture between student and institution.

Although the first college year has always been important, especially to those who live it, widespread institutional recognition of and response to that importance is a relatively new phenomenon. Beginning in the 1970s and continuing to the present, American higher education has witnessed what has been described as a "grass-roots movement" (Gardner, 1986b; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989, p. xiv) to enhance the freshman year. This movement, initiated by faculty, student affairs personnel, and senior administrators, has been fueled by concerns about recruiting and retaining the declining pool of traditional-aged students; by the objective needs of an entering student population that is becoming more diverse, both in terms of ethnicity and academic preparation; by external mandates for reform of undergraduate education and freshman education (Association of American Colleges, 1982; Boyer, 1987; National Endowment for the Humanities,1984; National Institute of

Education, 1984) and, last but not least, by genuine concern of members of the academy, many of whom remember their own "sink or swim" freshman year, for those on the lowest rung of the academic ladder.

Increased attention to freshmen may take curricular and co-curricular forms that vary from campus to campus. One such form, which Levine and Weingart (1974) called "the most popular, fastest-growing structure in freshman education" (p. 29), is the freshman seminar.

Levine (1985) defined a "seminar" as "a small class consisting of advanced students and a faculty member investigating a field of the faculty member's research" (p. 534). A seminar, according to the third edition of *Webster's New World Dictionary* (1988), is "a group of supervised students doing research or advanced study, as at a university" (p. 1220). These definitions imply that the seminar, at least in theory, is a democratic classroom structure which allows and encourages substantial interaction between faculty and students. "The seminar is at its best when it is a community of learners in which authority is truly shared among members of the group" (Cohen & Jody, 1978). In addition, as the definition states, the seminar form implies "advanced" study. Cohen and Jody argued that freshmen, as students, are advanced, "twelve years advanced into studenthood. . .no matter how deficient they may regard themselves, they have indeed learned much about being students through long experience of schooling" (p. 41). Levine, however, simply considered the freshman seminar "an exception" to the traditional definition (p. 534). The national report, *The Student in Higher Education*, published in 1968 by the Hazen Foundation argued that "the needs and the style of most 17-year-olds are more suited to the

seminar, and if anybody is able tolerate the lecture hall, it should be the senior" (Committee on the Student in Higher Education, 1968, p. 38).

As one of many nineteenth century German imports to American higher education, the seminar was first employed by Charles Kendall Adams at the University of Michigan in 1869 and became a familiar component of the curriculum at Harvard and Johns Hopkins Universities by 1876 (Levine, 1985). After experimenting with the seminar style of instruction for the first time, Harvard's Henry Adams was reported to exclaim, "As pedagogy, nothing could be more triumphant" (Rudolph, 1977, p. 145). The freshman seminar, as it has been implemented throughout American higher education, brings together some elements of seminar form and first-year students, but the purpose and content of this particular class type vary widely from campus to campus.

Evidence gathered since 1987 by the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience at the University of South Carolina indicates that the most common form of the freshman seminar could more accurately be termed the freshman "orientation" seminar (Fidler & Fidler, 1991). Such courses intend to ease the transition from high school to college and to prepare students for the expectations and demands of college life. However, in addition to seminars that emphasize college survival, others have been created to introduce students to a particular faculty member's academic specialty, to the purpose of higher education ("Freshman Seminar," 1989), or to particular ethical or societal issues (Appleton & Wong, 1989). On a number of campuses the freshman seminar has become the forum of choice within which to address issues of ethnic diversity (Gruber, 1990; Neuner, 1990). Freshman seminars may be interdisciplinary courses at the heart of a

general education core (T. Flynn, Dean, Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, MD, personal communication, February 2, 1991), or they may be employed to assist students of varying academic ability in developing essential academic skills such as expository writing, critical reasoning, and reading (Hamline University, 1990). Other campuses, departments, or professional schools offer freshman seminars to introduce and assimilate students to their chosen major or profession (Murphy, 1989). In increasing numbers of freshman seminars, the faculty instructor becomes academic advisor for seminar participants (T. Flynn, personal communication, February 2, 1991). Levine (1978) maintained that in the freshman seminar, "the advising relationship is perceived as more natural than that found in traditional faculty advising because it is based on a shared or common experience" (p. 146).

In addition to benefits that accrue to students, recent evidence has affirmed that freshman seminar programs often bring about other positive changes for the entire campus community. Freshman seminar programs often require that faculty undergo a teaching preparation workshop. For some faculty, this may be the only intensive "teacher-training" experience of their career. Campuses have reported the positive and often unintentional effects of freshman seminar faculty workshops on the overall quality of undergraduate instruction (V. Nix-Early, Coordinator for Faculty Development, West Chester University, West Chester, PA, personal communication, January 26, 1990). Because many freshman seminars integrate the curriculum and co-curriculum, the freshman seminar can become the catalyst for partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs professionals and can enhance the overall sense of campus community (Gardner, 1986a).

Other current reports and articles attest to the continuing popularity of the freshman seminar and recommend its implementation. The American Council on Education's 1990 *Campus Trends* report indicated that 40% of American campuses now offer a freshman seminar. Gaff (1989), in citing "Curriculum Trends of the '80s," included the freshman seminar as one of thirteen such trends. Gaff (1991) also maintained that such courses will continue as part of ongoing curriculum reform. Boyer (1987) suggested that, in order to give first-year students a sense of the "community whose structure, privileges, and responsibilities have been evolving for almost a millennium" (p. 43), institutions offer a credit-bearing freshman seminar to explore "The College: Its Values and Traditions" (p. 48).

Statement of the Problem

Clearly, the freshman seminar has become a contemporary fixture in American higher education. However, the term "freshman seminar" is often used indiscriminately, depending upon one's particular institutional frame of reference or knowledge base, to describe any one of what is, in reality, a variety of courses taught for different reasons and intending different outcomes.

Since its establishment in 1986, the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience at the University of South Carolina has become a internationally recognized source of information about freshman programming and especially about the freshman seminar. Prior to this study, the Center had abundant information, based upon its 1988 national survey of freshman seminar programming as well as other limited research efforts, to describe, prescribe, and validate the freshman orientation seminar (Cuseo, 1991; Gardner, 1989; Jewler, 1989; Sagaria,

1979; Siegel, 1989). However, no systematic, comprehensive study has been previously undertaken to identify, describe, categorize, or study the range of courses that are offered under the general rubric, "freshman seminar."

Educators from across the United States routinely request information from the National Resource Center on ways that freshman seminars are being adapted by different types of institutions to effect a variety of student and curricular outcomes that are congruent with variances in institutional missions and characteristics of students. Prior to this study, there was no systematic, comprehensive database from which to retrieve such information.

The general purposes of this study, therefore, were to expand the existing body of knowledge on the freshman seminar in American higher education and to define and describe the various seminar types that now exist on American campuses. This information was obtained by means of a survey instrument which was mailed on September 6, 1991, to all regionally accredited two- and four-year colleges and universities in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Pacific Island territories (N=2460), with a few exceptions as noted in the *Delimitations* section in Chapter 3.

Research Questions

Subject to delimitations as specified in Chapter 3, this study was designed to answer the following specific questions:

I. (A) Currently, what is the freshman seminar in American higher education? Can a concise definition of the freshman seminar be offered which is not only accurate but is also meaningful and useful for educators with little, if any, prior knowledge of this course type?

(B) How can the current variety of freshman seminars best be "typed" or categorized?

II. (A) What percentage of American colleges and universities offer a freshman seminar of any type?

(B) What are the characteristics of these seminars in general according to

1. goals,
2. content,
3. structure (a. maximum enrollment, b. grading, c. required or elective, d. amount of credit, e. where credits are applied),
4. instructors (Who teaches the freshman seminar?),
5. instructional activities,
6. measured outcomes (What outcomes are formally measured?),
7. longevity,
8. administration,
9. academic advising (Is the freshman seminar instructor the academic advisor for his/her students?),
10. instructor training,
11. institutional support (from students, faculty, administration)?

III. (A) What is the distribution of freshman seminars according to type?

(B) Is there a relationship between freshman seminar type (see pages 28 and 29) and the following institutional characteristics:

1. selectivity as measured by mean entering SAT or ACT scores and students' high school records,
2. Carnegie classification (1987),
3. size of institution's undergraduate population, and

4. ethnic diversity of institution's undergraduate population?

IV. How do freshman seminars differ by type according to the variables listed in Question #IIB (items 1 - 11)?

Significance of the Study

American higher education is a changing sociological and organizational phenomenon. Lincoln (1986) argued that a transformation of the American academic enterprise is currently underway, analogous to that which occurred from the years 1860 to 1900. No longer is a post-secondary education the exclusive property of elite, white, male students of consistent academic ability. No longer can colleges and universities simply admit students with no further attention to their academic readiness or social well-being. The future of the nation and of the world demands that larger numbers of citizens be educated successfully.

One does not have to be a higher education professional to be aware of the kind of challenges that these new realities present to the academy. As college doors swing wider to admit a larger proportion of students with a broader range of characteristics and academic abilities, attention to and retention of students become primary concerns. But coupled with concerns about attention/retention are persistent complaints about the poor academic preparation of entering students, the poor quality of undergraduate teaching, especially the teaching of freshmen, and about deficiencies in the undergraduate curriculum.

There is evidence to show that the freshman seminar has proven itself to be an inherently flexible, generally cost-efficient, and therefore popular curricular structure within which to address these and other issues on the American campus in the critical first year. Whether as a

means to bring coherence to an otherwise fragmented first-year curriculum or a classroom structure within which to help new students remedy academic deficiencies or hone essential academic skills; whether as a setting for more effective academic advising or a forum for discussing survival in college, the freshman seminar has become, on many American campuses, the classroom structure of choice.

The reasons for the popularity of this structure are at once both obvious and illusive. Inherently flexible, a freshman seminar can adapt to content as varied and creative as the minds of faculty and first-year students. But broader questions remain about the freshman seminar's permanence and continued viability within the curriculum. Is the freshman seminar only the latest in a series of knee-jerk reactions to various problems of the academy? If so, what are its chances for long-term survival? Is the freshman seminar, as Levine and Weingart (1974) would suggest, change merely for the sake of change, more form than substance? Or is there something inherent in the seminar format, some essential element of the teaching/learning transaction, that will give the freshman seminar, whatever the content, a continual and vital role in freshman education?

In order to begin the process of answering these broader questions, more objective information is needed about the creative ways in which the freshman seminar has been employed and adapted by campuses of all sizes, types, and degrees of selectivity to meet the needs of first-year students. By answering the "what," the "how," but more importantly the "why" of the freshman seminar, this study should provide essential information about this popular reform in American higher education. This information will enable current and future faculty, staff, and

administrators to design more relevant and meaningful educational experiences for succeeding generations of first-year students.

Summary

A number of current higher education issues have converged to create a heightened interest in the success of first-year students. Among those concerns are student retention, campus diversity, and educational quality. The freshman seminar is one structure that has been employed by many institutions to address these and other concerns.

Freshman seminars have been designed in a variety of ways that have made overall definition and categorization difficult. This study has provided the first overall look at this phenomenon in order to provide essential information to freshman programmers about creative options for and possible outcomes of this course.

Chapter 2 reviews the essential student development theories that have provided the underpinnings of many, if not most, freshman seminars. In addition, Chapter 2 provides a basic history of the freshman seminar and explores this course type as a popular piecemeal curriculum reform.

CHAPTER 2

Related Literature

Introduction: The Past as Prologue

"Going to college" has been a common rite of passage and a measure of maturity for students of traditional age, as well as an implicit guarantee of upward economic and social mobility for students of all ages, throughout the history of higher education (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Leaving home, family, and old friends to experience—perhaps for the first time—academic challenge, fear of failure, homesickness, autonomy, and, in varying degrees, unlimited freedom, makes the first year of college one of life's most significant and memorable transitions.

But life has never been easy for freshmen. Through the 800 years that freshmen have been coming to college, the history of their experience has often been characterized by stifling *in loco parentis*, mindless rules and regulations, humiliating forms of hazing, and authoritative predictions of failure. Most of these activities were justified by the mores of a particular epoch or in the name of long-standing tradition. Entering students reportedly endured these circumstances because obedience to and acceptance of college or university traditions were believed to be, and in fact were, tickets to ultimate acceptance by the institutions and, perhaps more importantly, by upper class students (Dwyer, 1989).

Well into the twentieth century, upper class students were the primary nemesis of freshmen. Stanford freshmen of the class of 1923

were served a "Frosh Death Notice" by the sophomores which included, among other threats, the following message: "Listen, you yellow streaked lumps of putty. WE ARE THE ITS, YOU ARE THE NITS. You are the buck privates in this man's army, permanently assigned to K. P." (Horowitz, 1987, p. 122).

But it was also these same upper class tormentors to whom first-year students turned for essential advice and direction about college life. Dwyer (1988) offered the concept, "the freshman as parishioner," to describe the role first-year students have played throughout the history of higher education. "Freshmen became accustomed to being told what to do. . . Others knew what was right, and freshmen had to learn from their direction and experience" (Dwyer, 1988, p. 44). The lack of such direction and support was, in fact, blamed for the unusually high dropout rate (10%) from the "hand-picked" first freshman class at Harvey Mudd College in 1959. Dwyer (1989) quoted the diary of a Harvey Mudd professor, "Davenport reported that some of our students are panic-stricken, even ready to bolt. Probably they suffer only from routine freshman blues, but without upperclassmen to diagnose their ailment, they are understandably demoralized" (p. 37).

Although *in loco parentis* was gradually relaxed over time for all students including freshmen, it was not until the mid-twentieth century that the traditions of hazing hapless college freshmen were significantly challenged. The challenge came from students themselves, specifically veterans of World War II who entered college on the GI bill in the late 1940s and early 1950s. According to Horowitz (1987), these older and more worldly students had little use for some of the more deprecating aspects of freshman life. "They balked at college traditions. At Lehigh,

they refused to wear the brown cap required of freshmen or light the cigarettes of upperclassmen. Their feistiness forced colleges for the first time to prohibit even mild hazing" (p. 187). It should be noted, however, that humiliating and/or violent forms of hazing did not disappear from the American campus circa 1950. Rather, such activities simply retreated to the confines of fraternities and some sororities.

The end of widespread hazing did not mark the end of all the obstacles that freshmen found on the path to college success. One significant obstacle which was commonly experienced by first-year students into the 1960s was the prevailing campus acceptance of a Darwinian ethic. This attitude which, in a nutshell, was "the strong will survive, the rest are not college material" was perhaps in its heyday during those heady post-World War II years of higher education expansion. Many first-year students who entered college during the 1950s and '60s can remember the proverbial warning, usually delivered at the opening freshman assembly, to "look to the right and look to the left and know that one of those individuals will not grace the opening sophomore assembly." What effect such chilling words had on freshman retention will never be known, but they hardly constituted a warm welcome to the campus.

This attitude created an atmosphere of competition on the American campus which, in 1968, members of the Hazen Foundation's Committee on the Student in Higher Education argued was counterproductive to the developmental needs of students. This committee reported that "competition must be drastically reduced. . . Despite the very important part competition plays in supporting the structure of American society, it nonetheless remains a major obstacle to

the real goals of higher education" (Committee on the Student in Higher Education, 1968, p. 50-51).

Before 1964, the year that federal anti-discrimination legislation was finally enforced, entering American college students were, in many ways, "peas in a pod." They were white, generally male, middle or upper class, and prepared, by virtue of white, middle, or upper class secondary schools, for the academic expectations of college. At least in terms of their characteristics and prior educational experiences, first-year students were engaged in fair competition. But as colleges and universities opened their doors to include larger numbers of older students, as well as students of diverse ethnic and educational backgrounds, this was no longer the case. In addition, as numbers of 18-year olds began to decline precipitously in 1982, colleges and universities began admitting larger proportions of smaller high school graduating classes (Levine, 1989). This resulted in an increased number of entering students who were unable to meet the traditional academic expectations of college life.

The increasingly diverse characteristics and abilities of entering college students have posed significant challenges to American colleges and universities. Recognizing an ethical obligation to meet the needs of entering students, most higher education institutions have been willing to shift the burden of responsibility for student success from the students' shoulders to a more even "shouldering" by student and institution. Although there may exist a few colleges and universities where a Darwinian ethic continues to prevail, the number of such campuses has decreased dramatically in the last 30 years. Generally speaking, most college faculty and administrators possess some

combination of altruism and realism. They want first-year students to succeed for the sake of the students themselves and the larger society, but also for the sake of their institution's survival and their own personal job security.

Not only have the past 30 years witnessed a change in institutional attitudes toward new students, but these years have also seen a related growth in the student development profession and the emergence of substantive research on college student development. In the years since 1960, social scientists from a number of specific disciplines have provided essential information about why students do or do not succeed in the college environment and what characteristics of students and/or institutions enhance or detract from that success.

Many colleges and universities have chosen to act on that information, to implement curricular and co-curricular programs intentionally designed to remove unnecessary obstacles, and to give students an extra boost up the academic ladder. The freshman seminar is but one of those programs. This course type has a long history of its own which pre-dates any systematic research linking it to desired outcomes. In essence it is a common classroom structure which institutions have used as a vehicle for curricular innovation and reform and as a means to address student needs intentionally within the first college year.

Research to Inform Freshman Programming

Current research and/or scholarship on college student characteristics, behavior, and development has provided a variety of theoretical windows through which to view the college experience as well as a comprehensive framework for freshman programming. Well-known

research efforts and bodies of theory relevant to student development during the college years include the following:

1. Stages of adolescent and adult cognitive, moral, and social development (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberg, & Tarule, 1986; Erikson, 1959; Kohlberg, 1971; Loevinger, 1976; Perry, 1970);
2. Life-tasks essential for overall development during the college years and during the freshman year (Brower,1990; Chickering, 1978);
3. The effects of college on students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991);
4. Changing characteristics of the nation's freshmen (Astin, Green, & Korn, 1987);
5. Student/institution fit (Terenzini & Pascarella,1977; Tinto, 1975);
6. Factors influencing student success, retention/attrition (Astin, 1977a, 1977b, 1984; Noel, Levitz, & Saluri, 1985; Pace, 1984; Pascarella, Terenzini, & Wolfle, 1986; Sanford, 1969; Tinto, 1988).

For its theoretical underpinnings, the freshman seminar has relied primarily on research identifying factors that influence the success and retention of matriculated students. Admittedly, some of these factors cannot be influenced or controlled by the college or university. Ongoing research at the University of Arizona (Christie & Dinham, 1991) has attempted to identify positive and negative influences on student social integration that are external to the institution such as parents and peers. This research has shown that the student's world outside the campus often has a greater ultimate influence over decisions to persist than the events of campus life.

But three interrelated factors which institutions have some ability to control and which have emerged over and over as predictors of student success are (a) a felt sense of community, (b) involvement of students in the total life of the institution, and (c) academic/social integration during the freshman year. The survey research that is the subject of this study has confirmed that the vast majority of freshman seminars have been intentionally designed with one or more of these factors as primary goals.

Community/Involvement/Integration: Essential Objectives for Freshman Programming

Community

Beginning in the 1960s, Nevitt Sanford and his colleagues at Stanford University began research on student development, alcohol use by students, and other topics which fell outside the interests of a single department (Sanford, 1969). In his classic, *Where Colleges Fail*, Sanford (1969) argued that colleges fail whenever they treat the student as less than a whole person; that learning depends on the whole personality, not merely intelligence. Not only are students often treated in a piecemeal fashion. Sanford also maintained that institutions themselves lack "coherence." He foreshadowed the later research of Astin (1977a) and Boyer (1989) by calling for "involvement" of students themselves and also of faculty in the lives of students. In the following statement, Sanford also despaired over what he considered the loss of institutional "community":

> It is fair to say that in most of our universities—and in many of our liberal arts colleges—a majority of the students suffer from a lack of a sense of community, confusion about values, a lack of intimate friends,

> a very tenuous sense of self (including serious doubt about their personal worth), and the absence of a great cause, movement, service, religion, belief system, or anything else that they might see as larger than themselves and in which they could become deeply involved (Sanford, 1988, p. 3).

In his recent investigations of undergraduate education, Ernest Boyer (1987, 1990) also found that "new [college] students have little sense of being inducted into a community whose structure, privileges, and responsibilities have been evolving for almost a millennium" (1987, p. 43). He stated that "a successful freshman-year program will convince students that they are part of an intellectually vital, caring community. . . and the spirit of community will be sustained by a climate on the campus where personal relationships are prized, where integrity is the hallmark of discourse, and where people speak and listen carefully to each other" (1987, p. 57).

Involvement

The correlation between student involvement and improved success/retention has been documented and researched by many educators, most notably Alexander Astin and Robert Pace. Astin (1984) offered the following definition of involvement which "is neither mysterious or esoteric":

> Quite simply, student involvement refers to the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience. Thus a highly involved student is one who, for example, devotes considerable energy to studying,

> spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students (Astin, 1984, p. 297).

Astin (1984) and Pace (1984) maintained that "the amount of student learning and personal development . . . is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement." Astin also found that highly involved students "who interact frequently with faculty" (Astin, 1977a, p. 223) are more satisfied with the college experience than those who do not. In his longitudinal study of college dropouts, Astin (1977b) discovered that

> virtually every significant effect on student persistence could be explained in terms of the involvement concept. Every positive factor was one that would be likely to increase student involvement in the undergraduate experience, while every negative factor was one that would be likely to reduce involvement" (p. 145).

In their large scale research of institutions rich in opportunities for involvement in out-of-class learning, Kuh, Schuh, Whitt (1991) and their colleagues offered case studies of colleges and universities where involvement is an explicit component of the institutional culture. Such institutions were cited for encouraging development of the whole person and "blurring in-class and out-of-class learning" (p. 142). Many freshman seminars exist to bridge the gap between the curriculum and co-curriculum and to facilitate student involvement in all aspects of campus life.

Social and academic integration

The importance of student social and academic integration into college life has been a central tenet of Vincent Tinto's research on student departure. Using as a framework the work of Dutch anthropologist, Arnold Van Gennep (1960), Tinto identified stages in the "rite of passage" into the first college year. The first stage, separation, is characterized by a decline in interactions with members of a former group. The second stage, transition, is a period during which the individual begins to interact with members of the new group. In this stage, persons learn the knowledge and skills necessary to function in the new group. The final stage, incorporation, may be marked by rituals or ceremonies which certify membership (Tinto, 1988, p. 442). Tinto maintained that during the freshman year, students may feel a sense of normlessness. "Having given up the norms and beliefs of past associations and not yet having adopted those appropriate to membership in a new community, the individual is left in a state of at least temporary anomie" (1988, pp. 442-443).

Tinto (1988) argued that social interactions are the primary vehicle through which new students become integrated into college life. But confounding this process is the lack of sufficient formal mechanisms that assure social interactions with other students and faculty. He stated:

> Institutional policies must be particularly sensitive to the separation and transitional difficulties new students face in attempting to make the "jump" to college. Most orientation programs are only partially successful in this regard, for they frequently fail to provide the long-term. . . assistance new students

> require. . .Orientation programs should span the first six weeks of the first year, if not the first semester. . . Orientation programs are most effective when they stress forms of contact and mentorship that enable new students to become competent members of academic and social communities of the college (pp. 451-452).

In their research into students' social and academic integration following a traditional orientation experience, Pascarella, Terenzini, and Wolfle (1986) concluded that "orientation might be more effectively conceived as an institution's ongoing attempt to enhance students' successful integration into the campus academic and social systems throughout the freshman year" (p. 172). Although a two-day orientation was shown to have positive indirect effects on persistence, these researchers argued that direct positive effects could only be expected to come from an orientation experience of longer duration. Even as early as 1968, noted educators were calling for "freshman orientation. . .as a whole year of acculturation to an entirely new and exciting activity. . .a year of integrating the pursuit of knowledge with the search for identity and intimacy (Committee on the Student in Higher Education, 1968, p. 61).

Tinto's views on the importance of academic and social integration have been validated by numbers of other campus-specific studies. One of the most significant of these studies (Fidler, 1991) is the report of a 17-year investigation of the freshman seminar (University 101) at the University of South Carolina. Fidler found not only a significant relationship between participation in University 101 and freshman-to-

sophomore retention, but also that the most significant variables in the course were "process" variables; that is, "University 101 participants are more likely than nonparticipants to achieve strong relationships with faculty. . . which reflects greater social integration" (p. 34).

Research on student behavior and development during the college years, and especially during the freshman year, has demonstrated that by implementing programs that increase a sense of community, student involvement, and academic/social integration of students, institutions can make a difference in the likelihood of new student success. With that information in hand, colleges and universities have sought structures, such as the freshman seminar, within which to accomplish these objectives.

The Freshman Seminar: An Historical Framework.

Indiscriminate use of terminology makes discussion of the history of the freshman seminar nothing less than a formidable challenge. For purposes of historical review, it is necessary to make the distinction between the two primary manifestations of freshman seminar programming in American higher education: the academic freshman seminar and the extended orientation freshman seminar. These course types are no longer mutually exclusive nor do they encompass all modes of the freshman seminar; however, historical records seem to indicate that the vast majority of freshman seminars were initiated with one or the other primary focus (Gordon, 1989).

Levine (1985) maintained that the academic freshman seminar began in 1945 as "a pedagogical technique introduced by Nathan Pusey at Lawrence College which provides freshmen an opportunity to work with a faculty member on a topic of mutual interest" (p. 525). In a

discussion of the freshman seminar from 1945 to the mid-1970s, Levine and Weingart (1974) termed the academic freshman seminar "one of a number of piecemeal reforms in American higher education" which, they added, "are far easier to implement than those that confront the total curriculum" (p. 9). Levine and Weingart suggested that, stripped of its title, the freshman seminar may be "just another small class for freshmen" (p. 9). They further questioned whether the popularity of the freshman seminar was perhaps evidence of the applicability of the Hawthorne effect to colleges and universities—that is, change for change's sake, even if only in course title, was valid if it "produces more interesting courses with happier professors and students" (p. 9).

Whether Levine and Weingart (1974) were correct in their suggestion that an academic freshman seminar may be essentially the same as any other small freshman class is a question to which there is no single, unequivocal answer. Other educators argued that the freshman seminar form, whatever the content, implied an egalitarian structure and respect for students that is not necessarily part and parcel of "just any small freshman class" (T. Flynn, personal communication, February 2,1991).

The second primary manifestion of freshman seminar programming in American higher education was the extended orientation or "coping with college" freshman seminar. Since the early 1970s, this form has accounted for the bulk of the proliferation of freshman seminar courses in the United States (National Resource Center, 1988). Such a course type made its first appearance at Boston University in 1888 and its first "for-credit" appearance at Reed College in 1911 (Fitts & Swift, 1928). These courses generally purported to introduce first-year students to

campus resources, teach essential study and time management skills, raise levels of student awareness about wellness and safety issues, and provide students an essential connection with each other and one adult on campus—the faculty or staff member who is the orientation seminar instructor (Jewler, 1989). Not only has the orientation seminar proven effective in enhancing freshman-to-sophomore retention, it has also been shown to result in improved grade point averages (Fidler, 1991) as well as increased graduation rates of enrolled students, especially those who are at risk academically (Fidler, 1991; Fidler & Hunter, 1989; Shanley & Witten, 1990).

In their review of the freshman seminar as a component of a general education curriculum, Levine and Weingart (1974) identified both intended and unintended advantages as well as problems which often accompany course implementation. A problem common to all general education courses including freshman seminars is that, in the metaphorical language of Boyer and Levine (1981), they may become "a spare room" that is poorly attended and indiscriminately used, in "the house of intellect" (p. 1). Traditional institutional reward systems often predicate against the teaching of courses that do not belong to a specific discipline. Other than "pay for services rendered," there are few extrinsic institutional rewards for faculty who teach such courses, especially in rigidly departmentalized colleges and graduate universities.

Levine and Weingart (1974), however, provided further evidence of the value of freshman seminars to both students and faculty. They stated:

> Faculty praise seminars for serving as a change of pace and for permitting more flexibility than regular courses.

> Many faculty use the course as a laboratory for experimenting with new instructional formats, and bring these new teaching methods back to their departmental classrooms" (p. 30).

Conclusion

Frederick Rudolph (1977) stated that "the curriculum has been an arena in which the dimensions of American culture have been measured. It has been one of those places where we have told ourselves who we are. It is important territory" (p. 1). Throughout the history of American higher education, the curriculum has reflected the needs and values of a changing and growing society. But every significant change has been accompanied by resistance from successive generations of academe's guardians of tradition.

As a variously defined classroom structure to meet the specific and changing needs of first-year college students, the freshman seminar represents a popular reform; and as many such reforms, it has grown slowly but persistently, from the bottom up, with little accompanying fanfare. Campus by campus, institutions have chosen the freshman seminar as a systematic way to provide a kinder, gentler introduction to college life, to give students essential information for their future academic and personal success, and to join content and process—specifically the process of creating essential connections between students, faculty, and the larger campus community.

This reform, as others before it, has seen its share of resistance from those who, as Mayhew, Ford, and Hubbard (1990), believe that "there should be some limit as to how much effort an institution should expend on individual students" (p. 101). But this research shows that,

in spite of inevitable resistance, many American colleges and universities have chosen to redefine the limits of their responsibility to first-year students through the implementation of a freshman seminar.

Summary

The history of the freshman experience has often reinforced, rather than reduced the trauma inherent in the freshman year experience. But, for a variety of reasons, the past 30 years in American higher education have seen the birth and growth of student development research and a change in attitude of colleges and universities toward a greater concern for the success of entering students. Because of the work of many social science researchers, institutions have been given knowledge about the many factors that impact student success. The most relevant of these factors to the success of freshman students are (a) a felt sense of community, (b) greater levels of involvement in the life of the campus, and (c) social and academic integration.

The freshman seminar has a much longer history both as a structure to provide extended orientation or particular academic content. This course type has been employed at a number of institutions for over 100 years, but only recently can it be accurately termed a genuine reform movement in American higher education.

Chapter 3 discusses the specific methodology employed in the reported survey research on the freshman seminar. It explores a three-phase research project, delineates the limitations of the research, and sets out the method of data analysis.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to expand existing knowledge on the nature and scope of the freshman seminar in American higher education. Specifically the study addressed four primary research questions with sub-components. These questions are as follows:

I. (A) Currently, what is the freshman seminar in American higher education? Can a concise definition of the freshman seminar be offered which is not only accurate but is also meaningful and useful for educators with little, if any, prior knowledge of this course type?

(B) How can the current variety of freshman seminars best be "typed" or categorized?

II. (A) What percentage of American colleges and universities offer a freshman seminar of any type?

(B) What are the characteristics of these seminars in general according to

1. goals,
2. content,
3. structure (a. maximum enrollment, b. grading, c. required or elective, d. amount of credit, e. where credit is applied),
4. instructors (Who teaches the freshman seminar?),
5. instructional activities,

6. measured outcomes (What outcomes are formally measured?),
7. longevity,
8. administration,
9. academic advising (Is the freshman seminar instructor the academic advisor for his/her students?),
10. instructor training,
11. institutional support (from students, faculty, administration)?

III. (A) What is the distribution of freshman seminars according to seminar type?

(B) Is there a relationship between freshman seminar type and the following institutional characteristics:

1. selectivity as measured by mean entering SAT or ACT scores and students' high school records,
2. Carnegie classification (1987),
3. size of institution's undergraduate population,
4. ethnic diversity of institution's undergraduate population?

These four characteristics were selected because they are primary ways in which institutions differentiate themselves and are differentiated by others. These characteristics could account for substantial varience in freshman programming for the following specific reasons:

1. Institutional selectivity has a clear and unequivocal impact on what institutions expect their first-year students to know and what these institutions believe should be the essential curricular/co-curricular components of the experience of first-year students (Astin, 1977).

2. The Carnegie classification system accounts for differences among institutions not only in terms of research dollars, degree programs, and, in the Liberal Arts I and II categories, selectivity, but also in terms of overall institutional character, prevailing culture, and external reputation. The latter three factors will often influence an institution's attitude toward different components of its mission—how funds are allocated to the needs of undergraduates versus graduates and where the institution sees itself on the research/teaching continuum. These factors are likely to have either a direct or indirect effect on the kinds of programs and services that are designed for freshmen.

3. Institutional size is a factor which is reported to influence the clarity of institutional mission, the extant sense of community, the overall coherence of the curriculum, and ultimately the quality and scope of freshman programming (Astin, 1977).

4. Ethnic diversity has increased dramatically on some of the nation's campuses in recent years. This increase has compelled institutions to rethink services and programming to meet more adequately the various needs of entering students (Justiz & Rendon, 1989; Pounds, 1989).

Other independent variables (two-year/four-year, public/private status, size of freshman class) were recorded on the survey instrument. Further Center studies may investigate a relationship between those variables and type of freshman seminar.

IV. How do freshman seminars differ by type according to the 11 variables listed in Question #IIB (items 1 - 11)?

In order to answer these questions, a three-phase research process was undertaken.

First Phase (March-May, 1991): Development of seminar typology

Prior to this study, the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience had on hand syllabi, course materials, and other documents describing approximately 500 freshman seminar courses offered by institutions across the United States. The majority of these course descriptions comprised presentations by colleges and universities at the over 40 Freshman Year Experience Conferences held since 1982. Over 200 were a part of nomination portfolios for the Center's three national campaigns to recognize Outstanding Freshman Advocates. Approximately 200 course descriptions were sent as attachments to the returned surveys of freshman orientation seminar programming conducted by the National Resource Center in 1988. Others were acquired at the Center's request to comprise the content of various articles in its two periodic publications, *The Freshman Year Experience Newsletter* and the *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience.*

Using these course descriptions and related materials, a typology to describe various categories of freshman seminars was hypothesized. A type was considered to be any specific freshman seminar for which at least five institutional examples could be cited. This typology consisted of five distinct seminar types which had been reported by colleges and universities, as well as departments and professional schools.

Descriptions of the five hypothesized freshman seminar types were provided on the survey instrument and read as follows:

1. *Extended orientation seminar.* Sometimes called freshman orientation, college survival, or student success course. May be

taught by faculty, administrators, and/or student affairs professionals. Content will likely include introduction to campus resources, time management, study skills, career planning, cultural diversity, and student development issues.

2. *Academic seminar with generally uniform academic content across sections.* May be either an elective or a required course for first-year students, sometimes interdisciplinary or theme-oriented, sometimes part of a required general education core. Will often include academic skills components such as critical thinking and expository writing.

3. *Academic seminars on various topics.* Specific topics are chosen by faculty who teach sections of these freshman seminars. Will generally be elective courses. Topics may evolve from any discipline or may include societal issues such as biological and chemical warfare, urban culture, animal research, tropical rain forests, the AIDS epidemic.

4. *Professional seminar.* Generally taught for first-year students within professional schools or specific disciplines such as engineering, health sciences, or education to prepare students for the demands of the major and the profession.

5. *Basic study skills seminar.* Generally offered for freshmen who are academically underprepared. Will focus on such basic skills as grammar, note-taking, and time management.

Each freshman seminar type was initially defined using written materials on hand. Definitions were then refined and validated through telephone conversations with at least one educator who was directly responsible for administering each hypothesized type of seminar. A sixth

category, "Other," was listed for seminars that fit in none of the other five categories.

Second Phase (June - August 1991): Developing and piloting the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming

Through consultation with researchers at the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience, University statisticians, and a University computer programmer at the University of South Carolina, the initial survey instrument was designed to answer the research questions posed by this study. In addition, other questions were included in order to provide longitudinal follow-up data to the first National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming conducted by the Center in 1988. The survey instrument was intentionally limited to four pages in order to encourage, or at least not to discourage, responses.

In order to test for verbal clarity and item validity, the initial (pilot) survey was mailed to directors of freshman seminars at the following 13 institutions: Emory University, DeKalb College, Harvard University, University of South Carolina, Georgia College, Mississippi University for Women, University of Idaho, Michigan State University (Engineering Department), State University of New York at Cortland, St. Lawrence University, Southwest Texas State University, New Mexico State University, and University of North Carolina, Charlotte. These institutions were known to have freshman seminars that represent the five types of freshman seminars hypothesized. With one exception, all pilot surveys were returned. Based on actual responses to the pilot survey as well as suggestions from the respondents, several small text changes were made on the final survey instrument.

Third Phase (September 1991): The Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming (Appendix A)

On September 6, 1991, a four-page survey instrument was mailed to the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs/Provosts of 2460 American colleges and universities. These institutions conformed to the following criteria:

1. regional accreditation
2. non-profit status
3. presence of a freshman class
4. student population of over 100
5. on-campus degree programs (Colleges and universities with only external degree programs were eliminated from the final sample.)
6. classification by the 1987 Carnegie system as Research I or II, Doctorate-Granting I or II, Comprehensive I or II, Liberal Arts I or II, and Community or Junior Colleges. Eighty-three institutions were included in the final data set which were not listed in the 1987 Carnegie classification system. These institutions were often two-year system campuses of a large university or small, non-selective two- or four-year institutions. There was no readily apparent reason for their omission from the Carnegie classification system.

Each survey was mailed with a cover letter from the Director of the National Resource Center explaining the purpose of the survey and requesting a response (Appendix B) and with a self-addressed envelope to encourage survey return. Recipients were asked to return the survey instrument no later than October 31, 1991. However, surveys continued to be received and included in the final data set through December 31,

1991. Carnegie classifications, selectivity information (high, medium, and low), two-year/four-year, and public/private status were coded by the researcher only on survey instruments that were returned.

As of December 31, 1991, 1064 surveys had been returned for a response rate of 43%. Although, a higher response rate had been desired, budget restrictions prevented the mailing of a reminder or a second survey to non-respondents.

In order to verify the acceptability of the response rate, statisticians who staff the Statistics Laboratory in the Statistics Department at the University of South Carolina were consulted. Their opinion was that the response rate was "very good" for a mailed survey instrument distributed nationally and was certainly acceptable unless there was inherent bias within the response set in terms of Carnegie classification, institutional selectivity, student population, and ethnic diversity. National databases on institutional selectivity, student population, and, of course, Carnegie classification were readily available. However, according to the senior researcher at the American Council on Education, there was no available database on overall institutional diversity which could be used to compare responding institutions to the national population (E. El-Khawas, personal communication, 1/31/92).

Selectivity

Institutional selectivity was determined using guidelines developed and reported in Peterson's 1990 edition of *Guide to Four-Year Colleges.* (Section entitled "Entrance Difficulty Directory"). Institutions judged by Peterson's *Guide* as being highly selective were those in which "more than 50% of the freshmen were in the top 10% of their high school class and scored over 1150 on the SAT or over 26 on the ACT. In highly

selective colleges, about 60% or fewer of the applicants were accepted."

Institutions judged as being of "medium" selectivity were those in which "more than 75% of the freshmen were in the top half of their high school class and scored over 900 on the SAT or over 18 on the ACT. In institutions of medium selectivity, about 85% or fewer of the applicants were accepted."

Institutions judged as having "low" selectivity were those in which "most freshmen were not in the top half of their high school class and scored somewhat below 900 on the SAT or below 19 on the ACT. Approximately 95% of applicants were accepted." This category also included non-selective or open admissions four-year institutions as defined by Peterson's *Guide* as well as all community and junior colleges. Table 1 provides a comparison of the sample to respondents in terms of institutional selectivity.

Carnegie Classifications

The 1987 Carnegie Classification includes all colleges and universities in the United States that were listed in the *1985-86 Higher Education General Information Survey of Institutional Characteristics*. This classification system groups institutions into categories on the basis of the level of degree offered—ranging from prebaccalaureate to the doctorate—and the comprehensiveness of their missions. The categories are as follows:

Research Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, and give high priority to research. They receive

Table 1

Comparison of Sample to Respondents by Institutional Selectivity

Category	Survey Population ($N = 2460$)	Respondents ($n = 1064$)
Highly selective	8.0%	7.9%
Moderately selective	41.0%	44.8%*
Low selectivity or non-selective	51.0%	47.2%*

*Based on z scores of 2.49, the proportions for these categories are slightly outside normal bounds (Normal = ±2).

annually at least $33.5 million in federal support and award at least 50 Ph.D. degrees each year.

Research Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, and give high priority to research. They receive annually at least $12.5 million in federal support and award at least 50 Ph.D. degrees each year.

Doctorate-granting Universities I: In addition to offering a full range of baccalaureate programs, the mission of these institutions includes a commitment to graduate education through the doctorate degree. They award at least 40 Ph.D. degrees annually in five or more academic disciplines.

Doctorate-granting Universities II: In addition to offering a full range of baccalaureate programs, the mission of these institutions includes a commitment to graduate education through the doctorate degree. They award annually 20 or more Ph.D. degrees in at least one discipline or 10 or more Ph.D. degrees in three or more disciplines.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I: These institutions offer baccalaureate programs and, with few exceptions, graduate education through the master's degree. More than half of their baccalaureate degrees are awarded in two or more occupational or professional disciplines such as engineering or business administration. All of the institutions in this group enroll at least 2500 students.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II: These institutions award more than half of their baccalaureate degrees in two or more occupational or professional disciplines, such as engineering or business administration, and many also offer graduate education through the master's degree. All of the institutions in this group enroll between 1500 and 2500 students.

Liberal Arts Colleges I: These highly selective institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges that award more than half of their baccalaureate degrees in art and science fields.

Liberal Arts Colleges II: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges that are less selective and award more than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields. This category also includes a group of colleges that award less than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields but, with fewer than 1500 students, are too small to be considered comprehensive.

Two-Year Community and Junior Colleges: These institutions offer certificate or degree programs through the Associate of Arts level and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.

Table 2 provides a comparison of the sample to the respondents in terms of Carnegie Classification.

Table 2

Comparison of Survey Population to Respondents by Carnegie Classification

Category	Survey Population ($N = 2460$)	Respondents ($n = 1064$)
Research I	3.0%	3.4%
Research II	1.4%	1.4%
Doctorate I	2.2%	2.7%
Doctorate II	2.4%	2.6%
Comprehensive I	17.0%	21.7%*
Comprehensive II	7.0%	8.0%
Liberal Arts I	6.0%	6.7%
Liberal Arts II	17.0%	18.7%
Two-year Colleges	35.0%	33.0%
Unclassified		1.6%

*Based on a z score of 2.54, the proportion of respondents for this category slightly exceeds normal bounds (Normal = ± 2).

Institutional size

Information on numbers of colleges by enrollment was drawn from U. S. Department of Education Data for Fall, 1989 as reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*, August 28, 1991, p. 11. Table 3 provides a comparison of the sample to respondents in terms of the size of the institutions' undergraduate population.

It is apparent from the data in Tables 1, 2, and 3 that, with noted exceptions, respondents are considered to be highly representative of the population in terms of institutional selectivity, Carnegie classification, and institutional size.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in support of this research project varied according to the specific research question under consideration. The answers to Research Question #I emerged from a number of sources including existing information maintained by the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience on a variety of existing freshman seminars as well as responses to the Second National Survey. Responses to open-ended questions provided information on commonalities and differences in course goals, topics, and intended outcomes. Other questions on the Second National Survey provided information on the range of class sizes, structures, and instructional activities.

Generally, the hypothesized typology was validated. With the exception of 17 respondents who selected the category "Other," all respondents reporting a freshman seminar (n = 696) selected one of the

Table 3

Comparison of Sample to Respondents by Size of Institutions' Undergraduate Population

Number of Students	Survey Population (N = 2460)	Respondents (n = 1064)
100 - 1,000	25.0%	23.0%
1,001 - 5,000	44.0%	47.9% *
5,001 - 10,000	13.0%	14.2%
10,001 - 20,000	8.0%	10.3%
Over 20,000	3.6%	4.7%

Note. Institutions with under 100 students were not included in the survey population.

*Based on a z score of 2.54, the proportion for this category falls slightly outside normal bounds (Normal = ±2).

five seminar types as being most like the seminar on their campus. However, it was clear from survey responses that few, if any, freshman seminars conformed precisely to the descriptions offered in the survey. Many seminars were hybrids, comprised of combinations of characteristics of two or more seminar types (see *Limitations* in this chapter for a more complete discussion).

Data analyses for Research Question #II consisted of frequencies and percentages reported in tabular format. Open-ended responses were coded by the researcher and two graduate student assistants in the National Resource Center.

Data analyses for Research Question #III also consisted of frequencies and percentages reported in tabular format. Chi-square analyses were performed to test for significance between type of freshman seminar (dependent variable) and the four following independent variables:

1. institutional selectivity
2. institutional type (according to Carnegie classification),
3. size of undergraduate population
4. ethnic diversity of undergraduate population.

Data analyses for Research Question #IV took the form of frequency counts and percentages by type of seminar (independent variable) as they were related to the following dependent variables:

goals

content

structure (enrollments, grading, amount and application of credit)

instructors

instructional activities

measured outcomes

longevity

administration

the role of academic advising

instructor training

institutional support (from students, faculty, administration)

Data were reported in tabular form, and chi-square analyses were performed to test for significance of relationships between independent and dependent variables.

The chi-square statistical test was employed to test for the significance of reported differences in Research Questions III and IV. Chi-square is a test that is commonly used to measure the departure of obtained frequencies from frequencies that would be expected by chance. A chi-square of zero indicates that no differences exist; chi-square scores can vary up from zero. The acceptable level of significance is .05.

Five of the 41 questions on the survey instrument generated open-ended responses. These responses were coded independently by three individuals—the researcher and two graduate students serving as interns in the National Resource Center. Because of the extraordinary commonality in responses, (no doubt related to the common use of current educational terminology and jargon), initial codes were remarkably consistent. The few inconsistencies were resolved by consensus of the three individuals involved in coding.

Among the richest sources of data in this study were the open-ended as well as unsolicited comments provided by respondents on the survey instrument. Also, many respondents enclosed syllabi, readings, and other materials which are used in freshman seminar courses.

Therefore, Chapter 5 in this study was added to provide a more in-depth look at unique freshman seminars in each category as well as seminars that fit in none of the listed categories. In addition, the respondents' own words, many of them poignant, some of them humorous, have been selectively provided for the reader's interest and edification.

Delimitations

This study was not intended to be a historical review of freshman life or the freshman seminar. It included data only on regionally accredited institutions of higher education in the following Carnegie categories: Research Universities I and II; Doctorate Granting Universities I and II; Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I and II; Liberal Arts Colleges I and II; and Two-Year Community, Junior and Technical Colleges. It did not include information on freshman seminar programming in proprietary schools or in "Professional schools and Other Specialized Institutions" as defined on pages 7 and 8 of the 1987 Carnegie classification system of colleges and universities or in institutions with a student population under 100. Colleges and/or universities identified as having only external degree programs were not included in the final sample. This study did not investigate any similar programs for first-year students in graduate-level schools or colleges.

Based on the recommendations of staff of the University of South Carolina's Statistical Department Laboratory, findings for two types of freshman seminars—Professional (n = 10), and Other (n = 17)—were eliminated from all but aggregate data analyses. The number of Professional seminars reported was too small to provide valid statistical analysis and is not representative of the national population in this category (see *Limitations* for further explanation). The category "Other"

represents no defined type of seminar, therefore statistical analyses would be meaningless. Seminars in this category have been reported and discussed in Chapter 5.

Limitations

1. In essence, there is no absolute, irrefutable way to categorize the many forms of the freshman seminar. It could be argued that there are as many distinct types as there are sections of freshman seminar courses being taught in American higher education and that no one course is like any other. In addition, the act of organizing or categorizing any complex phenomenon is, by its very nature, a subjective process.

The typology hypothesized herein was developed by this researcher in collaboration with other researchers in the National Resource Center and was based on volumes of data verified through systematic inquiry of freshman seminar directors. Almost all respondents were able to choose one of the five types as being "most like" the seminar offered on their campus. However, 44% of respondents to the Second National Survey considered their freshman seminar to be a hybrid, combining elements of two or more specific types. Use of the category "Other" was minimal. A total of 17 respondents (2.4%) chose that category.

2. Any single typology of a changing phenomenon may be limited by being time bound. Because the freshman seminar is a highly adaptable structure, new types may develop continually. This will limit the long-term validity of this typology.

3. This study relied upon the self-reported perceptions and knowledge of individuals, many of whom were responsible for and champions of the freshman seminar on a particular campus. This may have resulted in bias which limits the validity and generalizability of the

study. Conversely, the survey may have been answered by an individual who knows little about the freshman seminar. Again, this potentially reduces the validity and reliability of information.

4. Because of the absence of a comparative national database, the responses generated on the survey related to degree of campus diversity (Survey Question #7) could not be judged representative of American colleges and universities.

5. The hypothesized category for which there was the lowest number of responses (n = 10) was the "Professional" seminar. The response rate does not adequately correspond with the number of such seminars that has been reported by other sources to exist on American campuses. Research being conducted by Raymond Landis, Dean of the School of Engineering at California State University, Los Angeles, indicates that the number of such courses in engineering schools alone is in excess of 160 (R. Landis, personal communication, January 10, 1992; L. Carlson, Research Assistant, California State University, Los Angeles School of Engineering, personal communication, February 27, 1992). Since this survey was mailed to Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, it is apparent that it often did not make its way to professional schools or colleges where such a seminar might be offered for students in that unit only.

6. As this study was being undertaken, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was reportedly completing a new system of institutional classification. This new classification system was not available when data analyses were performed. The degree to which the Carnegie system will change--either in terms of how classifications are defined or in terms of institutional movement within the classification

system--may limit the long-term validity of these findings with respect to the relationship between freshman seminar type and institutional Carnegie classification

7. No survey responses were received from several respected institutions which are reputed to have long-standing, excellent freshman seminar programs. Although the absence of responses from these and other institutions with freshman seminars does not necessarily limit the validity of quantitative data, it nevertheless limits the richness of qualitative data that potentially could have been generated by the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming.

8. The final category of limitations can be called "quality of responses." Some survey respondents failed to read the directions or questions clearly, and their responses were often illogical or otherwise invalid. Recipients were asked to attach a course syllabus to the returned survey which was used by the researcher to clear up discrepancies and inaccuracies. In addition, the researcher placed a number of telephone calls to respondents in order to clarify information provided on the survey.

Summary

A three-phase research process was employed in order to conduct national survey research on the various types of freshman seminar courses currently in place in many American colleges and universities. The researcher developed and piloted a survey instrument which was then mailed to the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs at 2460 American colleges and universities. The survey response rate was 43%, and respondents were highly representative of the total population in terms of size of the undergraduate student population, Carnegie classification,

and selectivity. Data analyses varied according to the specific research question under consideration but included frequency counts, percentages and chi-square analyses to test for significance of relationships.

Study limitations included the inherent subjectivity of categorizing any phenomenon, possible responder bias, insufficient numbers of responses in the "Professional" seminar category, and inadequacy of some written responses. Chapter 4 will analyze and summarize survey data.

CHAPTER 4

Summary and Analysis of Data

Introduction

This chapter is organized to answer the specific research questions as outlined in Chapter 3. The format for presentation will include a re-statement of the research question, an identification of the survey item or items relevant to that research question, a report and discussion of the survey data relevant to that question. Whenever possible, current data have been compared to similar data from the First National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming conducted by the National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience in 1988 (Fidler & Fidler, 1991). The First National Survey was designed to investigate freshman seminars in general, and no attempt was made to categorize or type such courses. In addition, the survey instruments differ from each other in the content and structure of many survey items. Therefore, many findings of these similar surveys cannot be accurately compared.

Research Questions and Findings

Research Question #I

(A) Currently, what is the freshman seminar in American higher education? Can a concise definition of the freshman seminar be offered which is not only accurate but is also meaningful and useful for educators with little, if any, prior knowledge of this course type?

In creating a single definition for a complex phenomenon, it is difficult to strike a balance between overgeneralization on the one hand

and restrictive specificity on the other. With this realization, the following concise definition for the freshman seminar has been developed through an analysis of reported goals, content, and structural features of such courses as reported in the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming.

> The freshman seminar is a course intended to enhance the academic and/or social integration of first-year students by introducing them (a) to a variety of specific topics which vary by seminar type, (b) to essential skills for college success, and (c) to selected processes, the most common of which is the creation of a peer group. This course may or may not be a "seminar" as that term is traditionally defined as a small class with advanced students.

The above definition applies to *all* freshman seminars in spite of substantial variance in primary goals, specific content, and structural elements such as grading, credits, and enrollments. (For survey findings relative to particular goals, topics, and structural elements of freshman seminars in general and by seminar type, see Research Questions IIB and IV.)

While the above definition is, at least in the opinion of the researcher, accurate based on available information about freshman seminars, it may or may not be judged "meaningful" or "useful" depending on one's prior knowledge of this course type. Educators who know either little or nothing about the freshman seminar will likely find that this definition fails to offer sufficient descriptive information about

this course and the various ways it can be adapted to meet the needs of specific students on specific campuses.

(B) How can the current variety of freshman seminars best be "typed" or "categorized."

The hypothesized typology of freshman seminars as provided on the survey instrument was generally validated through survey responses. Only 17 institutions of the 696 with freshman seminars (2.43%) selected the category "Other" when responding to type of freshman seminar offered. The most common freshman seminar types are the following:

1. Extended orientation seminars
2. Academic seminars with common content across sections
3. Academic seminars with content that varies by section
4. Professional seminars (Not included in data analyses. See *Limitations* in Chapter 3 for discussion.)
5. Basic study skills seminars

Survey responses indicated that the above hypothesized types are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Approximately 30% of survey respondents indicated that a single freshman seminar was, in their opinion, some combination of two or more listed types. (See Table 15 on page 71 for the frequency distribution of seminars by type.)

Research Question #II

(A) What percentage of American colleges and universities offer a freshman seminar of any type?

A total of 696 of the 1,064 responders (65.4%) to the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming indicated that their institution offers a freshman seminar course of some type. This finding is consistent with findings of the First National Survey. Sixty-eight

percent of institutions that responded in 1988 to the First National Survey reported offering a freshman seminar course.

The 696 institutions that responded to the Second National Survey indicating that they offer a freshman seminar are listed in alphabetical order in Appendix C. Because responding institutions were highly representative of the population (Tables 1, 2, and 3), it can be reasonably assumed that currently, approximately two-thirds of all American colleges and universities offer a freshman seminar course.

In addition, another 58 institutions (5.4%) (also listed alphabetically in Appendix C) responded that a freshman seminar is planned for the next academic year (1992-1993). No further analysis of institutions in this second category was undertaken.

(B) What are the characteristics of these seminars in general according to

1. *goals,*
2. *content,*
3. *structure (maximum enrollments, grading, whether the seminar is required, amount and application of academic credit),*
4. *instructors (Who teaches the freshman seminar?),*
5. *instructional activities,*
6. *measured outcomes (What outcomes are formally measured?),*
7. *longevity,*
8. *administration,*
9. *academic advising (Is the freshman seminar instructor the academic advisor for his/her students?),*
10. *instructor training,*
11. *institutional support (from students, faculty, administration)?*

#1 - Goals. Item #12 on survey instrument asked, "In your opinion, what are three primary goals of your freshman seminar program?" Although only three lines were provided for responses, some responders compressed as many as ten goals onto the three available lines. For this item, the computer program accepted a maximum of six responses.

Table 4 presents these goals in descending order of their reported frequency. Only goals reported more than ten times have been listed. Goals listed fewer than ten times included "develop religious values," and "develop leadership skills."

The goal reported with the greatest frequency, "academic skills development," was implemented by reporting institutions in a variety of ways depending on the level of entering students' academic preparation. This category included basic or remedial skills development as well as the enhancement of critical thinking, writing, and advanced research skills. As the list in Table 4 indicates, reported course goals vary from those that are broad and encompassing to those that are narrow and specific. Each of these reported goals comprises some component of "academic or social integration," which is the overriding purpose for all freshman seminars.

#2 - Content. Item #13 on the survey instrument asked, "If your seminar has a common curriculum across sections, what, in your opinion, are the most important topics that comprise the content of the freshman seminar? (List up to five topics.)" Again respondents often listed many more than five topics. The computer program accepted ten responses for this item.

Table 5 presents these topics in descending order of their frequency. Only those topics cited more than 40 times are listed.

However, other topics mentioned by fewer than 40 respondents included "oral communication," "introduction to the disciplines," "classic books," "religion and spirituality," "decision making," "money management," and "leadership."

Table 4

Reported Goals of Freshman Seminars (N = 696)

Goal	Frequency
Develop academic skills	356
Provide knowledge of campus resources	209
Ease transition from high school to college	192
Increase likelihood of college success	183
Develop major and career plans	174
Provide opportunity for interaction with faculty	123
Develop student support groups	96
Help students feel connected to institution	89
Introduce the purpose of higher education	89
Increase retention	85
Provide opportunity for student self-evaluation	85
Introduce general education/liberal arts	48
Create campus community	40
Provide common educational experience	29
Increase student involvement	29
Introduce disciplines	27
Develop values and ethics	26

Note. This list includes only goals reported by at least 25 institutions. Percentages were not calculated because all 696 institutions with freshman seminars did not answer this question.

Table 5

Reported Topics Comprising the Content of Freshman Seminars ($N = 612$)

Subject	Frequency
Basic study skills	388
Time management	246
Campus facilities and resources	166
Wellness (alcohol/drug abuse, STDs, nutrition)	131
Relationship issues (roommates, dating, date rape)	116
Self knowledge/awareness/discipline/evaluation	113
Campus rules and regulations	110
Cultural diversity	88
Critical thinking and writing	78
Goal setting	71
Using the library	62
Liberal arts/general education	56
Purpose of higher education	55
Values clarification	53
History and mission of institution	48
Current societal issues	45

Note. This list includes only items reported by at least 40 institutions. Percentages of institutions reporting each topic were not calculated because all 612 institutions offering freshman seminars with common content did not answer this question.

As the development of academic skills is the most commonly reported goal for freshman seminars in general, so basic study skills is the most common topic. The second most popular topic, time management, is often a prerequisite to the development and/or improvement of academic skills.

#3 - Structure. The answers to this question emerged from responses to survey items #16, #20, #31, #36, #37, and #38. These responses provided data on (a) maximum enrollments for seminar classes, (b) how the freshman seminar is graded, (c) whether the freshman seminar is required of all students, (d) amount of academic credit awarded for freshman seminars, and (e) how credits are applied.

(a) maximum enrollment. As Table 6 indicates, only 107 institutions (16.1%) of those with freshman seminars limit enrollment to no more than 15 students. These classes most closely resemble "seminars" as that term means "small group." An additional 348 institutions (52%) cap seminar enrollments at 25. The remaining seminar courses which enroll over 25 students (213 or 31.9%) cannot accurately be termed "seminars."

Many factors, other than what is in the best interest of students and faculty or what was the original intent of course designers, determine maximum class enrollments. A number of survey respondents indicated that either limited funds, an unforeseen surplus of students, or a shortage of faculty had resulted in freshman seminar enrollments that exceeded the maximum allowed.

(b) grading. Survey results indicated that 68% of freshman seminars are graded by a letter grade, 32% by pass/fail or satisfactory/

Table 6

Percentage of Institutions Reporting Maximum Allowable Enrollments in Freshman Seminars (N = 669)

Maximum Enrollment	Percentage
Up to 15	16.1
16 - 25	52.0
26 - 40	20.5
41 and up	11.4

unsatisfactory, or, in the case of Hampshire College in Amherst, Massachusetts, no grade whatsoever.

Prior to the Second National Survey, there was anecdotal evidence to indicate that increasing numbers of freshman seminar courses were adopting a letter grading system. When comparing the results of this survey to those of the First National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming, there was only a slight increase in the percentage of institutions grading the freshman seminar by a letter grade (61% in 1988, 68% in 1991).

(c) whether course is required. Survey responses indicated that 44.9% of freshman seminars are required for all first-year students and 26.8% for some first-year students (most frequently for academically "high risk" students). Twenty-eight percent of freshman seminars are elective courses for all entering students.

At institutions offering freshman seminar courses, the proportion of those courses that are required for all entering students (44.9%) has

remained almost constant since the 1988 survey. In 1988, 43.5% of institutions offering a freshman seminar required this course for all freshmen. There are no previous data which can be used to compare the proportion of seminars required for "some" students.

In addition to courses required for high risk or undecided students, freshman seminars are occasionally required for other student sub-groups such as athletes, students in specific majors, and even honors students.

(d) academic credit. Survey results indicated that the overwhelming majority (85.6%) of freshman seminars carry academic credit. This finding is consistent with the 1988 findings. At that time, 82% of freshman seminars reportedly carried academic credit (Fidler & Fidler, 1991). The remainder (14.4%) of current seminars carry either no credit or "institutional" credit which counts toward eligibility requirements for some types of financial aid or space in residence halls. Table 7 provides a percentage breakdown in numbers of credits (semester hours, quarter hours, and other).

Gardner (1989) has argued that "if freshman seminars are to be legitimate at all, they must carry academic credit. Academic credit is a necessity for the ultimate institutionalization of these courses, because it is the grand legitimizer in American higher education" (p. 245). As Gardner's statement implies and as the reported demise of many non-credit freshman seminars has shown, the absence of academic credit can be the "kiss of death" for freshman seminars.

Survey findings with respect to the most common number of credits carried by freshman seminars were consistent with findings of the First National Survey. In both 1988 and 1991, the one-credit hour

Table 7

Percentage of Institutions Reporting Amount of Credit Awarded Freshman Seminars

(N = 594)

Amount of Credit Awarded	Percentage
1 semester hour	44.8
2 semester hours	13.1
3 semester hours	19.2
More than 3 semester hours	6.0
Quarter hours	11.1
Other	5.7

course was most common. However, as researchers at the National Resource Center can bear witness, few administrators of one-credit hour freshman seminars are able to accomplish what they would like in one contact hour per week. The battle for more credit hours is a common and recurring one for many administrators of freshman seminar programs.

e) how credits are applied. Table 8 indicates survey findings on how freshman seminar credits are applied to various credit categories (i.e., core requirements, general education, major requirements, electives, and other).

There are no previous data on the application of credits which can be used for comparison. These findings are consistent with the most common role of the freshman seminar as an add-on course which does not "belong" to a specific discipline or major. However, a notable proportion (almost 20%) are considered "core" courses, which indicates

Table 8

Percentage of Institutions Reporting How Freshman Seminar Credits are Applied

(N = 592)

How Applied	Percentage
Core Requirement	19.4
General Education	29.7
Elective	45.4
Major Requirement	2.4
Other	4.1

that they are required of all students and perceived to be central to the institution's curriculum.

#4 - Instructors. Survey item #18 asked, "Who teaches the freshman seminar—faculty, student affairs professionals, other campus administrators, upper-level undergraduate students, graduate students, and other?" Responders were directed to check all applicable categories as these categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table 9 provides a percentage breakdown according to category of freshman seminar instructors. There are no previous data on freshman seminar instructors which can be used for comparison. It is notable that faculty teach or co-teach in 84.5% of freshman seminar programs of all types. Von Frank (1985) argued that faculty input and support are absolutely essential to survival of the freshman seminar on many campuses because faculty participation, just as the awarding of academic credit, serves to legitimize this course. These data do not provide information on faculty motivation for teaching the freshman

Table 9

Percentage of Institutions Reporting Freshman Seminar Instructors (N = 696)

Instructors	Percentage
Faculty	84.5
Student affairs professionals	50.8
Campus administrators	34.1
Upper-level undergraduate students	8.1
Graduate students	4.2
Other	10.2

seminar. Faculty may elect or be required to teach this course, either with or without additional compensation. Therefore, no assumptions can be made from this particular finding relative to faculty attitudes about teaching the freshman seminar.

It should be noted that successful freshman seminars are taught by individuals other than faculty members. The 75-year old freshman seminar at Ohio State University is taught entirely by graduate students and student affairs professionals (See Chapter 5). Ohio State faculty members provide only an occasional "guest" lecture. In fact, as these findings indicate, student affairs professionals teach or co-teach in 52% of all freshman seminar programs. It cannot be assumed that these seminars are less successful than those taught only by faculty. Finally, instructors identified in the category "Other" included alumni, adjunct faculty, trustees, and community leaders.

#5 - Instructional Activities. Survey item #15 asked responders to "list up to five primary instructional (pedagogical) activities employed in the freshman seminar (for example: lecture, group discussion)." In many cases, responders listed more than five such activities. The computer program was designed to accept up to ten responses for this question.

Table 10

Instructional Activities in Freshman Seminars (N = 696)

Activity	Frequency
Class discussion	542
Lecture	532
Group projects	328
Video presentations/films	181
Guest lectures	162
Written assignments	110
Student presentations	106
Student journals	71
Tours of campus facilities	69
Individual conferences	68
Role playing/drama	53
Academic counseling	40
Quizzes	32
Cultural events	29
Learning styles inventories	29

Note. This list includes only activities reported by at least 25 institutions. Percentages were not calculated because all 696 institutions with freshman seminars did not answer this question.

Table 10 presents a list of instructional activities in descending order of popularity that were cited by at least 25 institutions. Although "class discussion," was reported to be the most frequent instructional activity, close behind was the lecture, a pedagogical method more common to traditional college classes. Other instructional activities cited fewer than 25 times included the following: "required campus events," "placement testing," "debates," "panel discussions," "interviews," "community service," "events at instructors' homes," "book reviews," "peer tutoring," and "mock trials."

With no readily available information on the range of instructional activities commonly employed in traditional college classes, it is difficult to draw a meaningful comparison between freshman seminars and other freshman classes in terms of typical instructional activities. However, the data seem to indicate a greater variety of instructional activities within freshman seminars than would normally be experienced in routine college classrooms. Levine and Weingart (1974) maintained that the freshman seminar often becomes a sort of pedagogical laboratory in which instructors can experiment with instructional methods before utilizing them in regular classes.

#6 - Evaluation. Survey item #24 asked, "Which, if any, of the following freshman seminar outcomes are formally evaluated—content knowledge, student opinions of or satisfaction with course/instructor, persistence to sophomore year, persistence to graduation, student use of campus services, student participation in campus activities, out-of-class interaction with faculty, friendships among freshman seminar classmates, other?" Responders were directed to check all applicable items.

Table 11

Percentage of Institutions Measuring Outcomes of Freshman Seminars (N = 694)

Outcome	Percentage
Student satisfaction with course/instructor	66.6
Freshman-to-sophomore persistence	43.2
Content knowledge	34.8
Graduation	29.3
Use of campus services	16.9
Participation in campus activities	16.1
Out-of-class interaction with faculty	10.5
Friendships with seminar students	10.7
Other	6.9

Table 11 presents percentages of institutions that reported evaluating these possible freshman seminar outcomes.

"Student satisfaction with course and instructor" was the most frequently reported measured outcome, perhaps because it is relatively easy to evaluate, relies strictly on student self-report, and is already a common outcome measured by routine end-of-semester course evaluations. Evaluating freshman-to-sophomore persistence, however, requires systematic tracking of data as well as attention to research design. This potential outcome, which was the second most frequently reported, is difficult to assess unless there is a readily available control group of students who do not receive the "treatment," in this case, the freshman seminar. The fact that a relatively large percentage of institutions are tracking this outcome is an indication of its importance

to freshman seminar programmers and their institutions. The third most frequently measured outcome, content knowledge, is generally evaluated through routine periodic examinations. Finally, for this question the category "other" included a variety of specific desired outcomes such as "increased tolerance of diversity" and "change in attitude toward higher education."

Many respondents added a comment to this section to indicate their intent to evaluate the freshman seminar in future years and the recognized need on their campus for such evaluation. In spite of a general lack of research expertise among rank and file faculty, assessment is becoming a familiar fact of academic life. As budgets shrink, freshman seminars, still considered by many to be "extra" courses, will have to continue proving themselves effective by whatever criteria institutions designate. The ultimate fate of many of these courses will undoubtedly hinge on the results of such evaluations.

#7 - Longevity. Survey item #30 asked, "How long has the freshman seminar been offered on your campus?" The responses in this category ranged from 1 year (n = 73) to 75 years (n = 1). Table 12 presents percentages of institutions reporting various lengths of time the freshman seminar has been offered. The oldest reported freshman seminar is at Ohio State University. (See Chapter 5 for a in-depth discussion of the Ohio State seminar.)

Responses to this question indicated that the freshman seminar is a recent course addition on many campuses. It is notable that over 23% of such courses were begun in the last two years, approximately 60% in the past five years, and over 80% since 1980.

Table 12

Percentages of Institutions Reporting Length of Time Freshman Seminar Has Been Offered (N = 653)

Length of Time	Percentage
Under 2 years	23.3
From 2 to 5 years	35.7
From 5 to 10 years	22.3
From 10 to 20 years	14.5
Over 20 years	4.1

The dramatic proliferation of freshman seminars within the past ten years is likely in response to the use of these courses as possible solutions to two pressing problems of the academy. The first problem is the rapid change in "who's coming to college;" the second is the very real financial crisis facing institutions of higher education in both the public and private sector.

With respect to the new generation of entering students, colleges and universities are admitting increasing numbers of academically-underprepared students in order to meet access and equity goals and in order to fill otherwise empty classroom seats. These students, if they are to be successful, require a wide range of support services and a more intentional introduction to the expectations of higher education. Such information and support can be offered through a freshman seminar course.

Once students have been recruited and admitted, institutions have a vested interest in keeping them for a host of altruistic reasons but also

because they pay the bills. The freshman seminar has a growing research-based reputation as a generally cost-effective way to (a) "sell" the campus to prospective freshmen--to quote a survey response--"as a caring place," and (b) reduce the current rate of freshman-to-sophomore attrition which threatens the financial viability of many institutions.

While "increase retention" was only the tenth most frequently reported goal for freshman seminars (p. 53), other more popular goals, such as "develop academic skills," "provide opportunity for interaction with faculty," and "develop student support groups" are known to have either direct or indirect positive effects on retention (Tinto, 1988). Although campus fiscal concerns and the needs of underprepared students are not the only reasons for the recent increase in numbers of freshman seminars, they are, in the opinion of the researcher, the primary impetus behind the recent and continuing popularity of this course.

#8 - Administration. The answers to this question emerged from responses to survey items #21, #22, and #23. These items asked which campus unit has content responsibility for the freshman seminar, whether there is an official freshman seminar "director," and, if so, that individual's faculty rank or administrative position.

Table 13 provides a list, in descending order of frequency, of departments, colleges, or other campus units that are responsible for establishing freshman seminar content. Only campus units reported by more than ten institutions are listed in Table 13. Those units reported fewer than ten times included "president's office," "admissions office," "retention department," and "honors program."

Table 13

Campus Units With Freshman Seminar Content Responsibility (N = 591)

Department	Percentage
Student Affairs	18
Academic College (other than University/General College listed below)	15
Academic Department (other than English or Psyc./Social Sci. listed below)	13
Provost/Academic Affairs Office	12
Task Force or Committee	12
Academic Skills/Learning Skills Office	8
Guidance and Counseling Office	7
Freshman Year Experience/Freshman Studies Office	4
Joint Administration (Academic Affairs and Student Affairs)	4
Psychology/Social Science Department	2.5
English Department/Writing Program	2.5
University/General College	2

Note. This table includes only those campus units reported by at least 10 institutions.

A total of 73.1% (n = 691) of institutions reported that there is an official director of the freshman seminar. Table 14 gives information on faculty status or administrative position of freshman seminar directors in descending order of response frequency.

As faculty have primary instructional responsibilities for the freshman seminar, so do they also have primary administrative responsibility. Data from the Second National Survey indicate that 40% of freshman seminars are administered by an academic unit—either an

Table 14

Directors of Freshman Seminars by Primary Job Title (N = 520)

Title	Percentage
Faculty Member (at Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor rank)	46
Student Affairs Administrator	17
Academic Dean	17
Director of Guidance and Counseling	7
Other	5
Director/Dean of Freshman Programs	5
Director of Learning Center	3

Note. This list includes only information reported by at least 15 institutions.

academic college, department, or academic affairs office. In addition, 18% are administered by a division of student affairs. Most campuses do appoint someone "director" of the freshman seminar, and that individual is most likely to be a faculty member.

#9 - Academic Advising. Survey responses indicated that (a) freshman seminar instructors are the academic advisors for all students in their freshman seminar classes in 22.6% of institutions, (b) freshman seminar instructors are the academic advisor for some of their seminar students in 22.6% of institutions, and (c) freshman seminar instructors do not serve as academic advisors for seminar students in 54.9% of institutions with a freshman seminar.

Prior to this survey, there was anecdotal evidence to suggest that freshman seminar instructors increasingly serve simultaneously as academic advisors for seminar students. However, no previous data exist

that can be used for longitudinal comparison. Responses to the survey indicate that academic advising for some or all seminar students is currently the responsibility of seminar instructors in 45.2% of institutions reporting freshman seminars.

#10 - Instructor training. Survey results indicated that 71.4% of institutions offer some form of freshman seminar instructor training. In addition, for 46.7% of institutions, this training is a prerequisite for teaching the freshman seminar.

The offering of instructor training by over two-thirds of institutions with freshman seminars is an indication that instructors, whether faculty or staff, may not necessarily be assumed to have all the requisite skills for this kind of instruction. The freshman seminar course elevates a "process" such as group building to a level equal with "content." Facilitating classroom process may be unfamiliar to seminar instructors. In addition, the content of such courses often revolves around current and sensitive issues such as human sexuality, sexual harassment, racial equality, relationships, etc. These are issues that faculty and staff may be reluctant to address without some sort of prior instruction and/or information.

#11 - Institutional Support. Question #41, the final question on the Second National Survey, asked each respondent to rank "in your opinion, the overall level of campus support (from students, faculty, staff, administration) for the freshman seminar." Survey results indicated that only 7.5% of responders ranked the level of campus support as "low" or "very low," 27.5% believed campus support was "neutral," and 64.9% ranked campus support as "high" or "very high."

This final question called for a subjective response, and, therefore, responses may have been biased. More objective measures of campus support such as budgets, quality and quantity of credit awarded, and numbers of students taking the course as an elective were measured on the survey. However, results were reported in many different ways and were difficult to standardize and to equate with campus support. Based on the opinions of responders, the data seem to indicate that the majority of freshman seminars enjoy strong campus support.

Research Question #III

(A). What is the distribution of current freshman seminars according to seminar type?

Table 15 provides data on how seminars are distributed by seminar type. Clearly, the vast majority of current freshman seminars in American higher education are of the extended orientation variety. The next most common type of seminar is the academic seminar which has common or consistent content across all sections. Assuming that the freshman seminar is generally designed to meet what the institution perceives to be the needs of entering students, these results imply the following: At least 65.6% of American colleges and universities believe that first-year students will benefit from participating in a class in which, irrespective of content, some attention is paid to the creation of a peer group and to the development of a close relationship between the faculty member and individual students. The predominance of extended orientation seminars indicates that on at least 46% of American campuses, the general assumption is that some entering students do not possess, and therefore need to be provided, the strategies, behaviors, and knowledge essential to college success.

Table 15

Distribution of Freshman Seminars by Type (N = 696)

Seminar Type	Percentage
Extended orientation seminars (n = 494)	71.0
Academic seminars (consistent academic content across sections) (n = 84)	12.1
Academic seminars (content varies by section) (n = 49)	7.0
Professional seminars (n = 10)	1.4*
Study skills seminars (n = 42)	6.0
Other (n = 17)	2.4**

*This number is not representative of seminars known to exist in this category. Therefore this category has been eliminated from further data analysis. (See *Limitations* in Chapter 3 for further discussion.)

**Since this category represents a variety of seminars, it has been eliminated from further data analysis.

(B) Is there a relationship between freshman seminar type and the following institutional characteristics:

1. *selectivity as measured by mean entering SAT or ACT scores and students' high school records,*
2. *Carnegie classification (1987),*
3. *size of institution's undergraduate population,*
4. *ethnic diversity of institution's undergraduate population?*

Table 16, 17, 18, and 19 provide data relevant to this four-part question.

As these data indicate, the type of freshman seminar offered at a particular college or university is more a function of institutional selectivity (Table 16) than any of the other three characteristics. Highly selective institutions are far more likely to offer academic seminars, particularly those of various content, and are highly unlikely to offer

Table 16

Type of Freshman Seminar by Institutional Selectivity (N = 667)

		Seminar Type			
		A (n = 493)	B (n = 83)	C (n = 49)	D (n = 42)
Selectivity	High (n = 52)	13.46% (n = 7)	32.69% (n = 17)	51.92% (n = 27)	1.92% (n = 1)
	Moderate (n = 323)	71.83% (n = 232)	17.03% (n = 55)	6.50% (n = 21)	4.64% (n = 15)
	Low (n = 292)	86.99% (n = 254)	3.77% (n = 11)	0.34% (n = 1)	8.90% (n = 26)

χ^2 (6,N = 667) = 239.504, p<.001

Note. Seminar Type A = Extented Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

basic study skills seminars. Institutions of low selectivity are more likely to offer either an extended orientation or a basic study skills seminar.

In Table 17, data originally analyzed for each of nine discrete Carnegie institutional classifications (Research I, Research II, Doctorate Granting I, Doctorate Granting II, Comprehensive I, Comprehensive II, Liberal Arts I, Liberal Arts II, and Two- year Colleges) were collapsed, and data analyses were performed instead for the following six categories: Research Universities, Doctorate-Granting Colleges and Universities, Comprehensive Colleges and Universities, Liberal Arts I and Liberal Arts II Colleges, and Two-Year Colleges (including both community and junior colleges). In the Research, Doctorate-Granting, and Comprehensive categories, institutions at Levels I and II share sufficient characteristics so that they can be grouped together for data analysis relative to

Table 17

Type of Freshman Seminar by Carnegie Classification (N = 613)

Carnegie Classification	Seminar Type A (n = 451)	B (n = 77)	C (n = 48)	D (n = 37)
Research I & II (n = 33)	45.45% (n = 15)	9.09% (n = 3)	36.36% (n = 12)	9.09% (n = 3)
Doctorate I & II (n = 37)	70.27% (n = 26)	16.22% (n = 6)	5.41% (n = 2)	8.11% (n = 3)
Comp I & II (n = 195)	75.90% (n = 148)	14.46% (n = 28)	5.13% (n = 10)	4.62% (n = 9)
Liberal Arts I (n = 44)	13.64% (n = 6)	31.82% (n = 14)	50.00% (n = 22)	4.55% (n = 2)
Liberal Arts II (n = 135)	77.78% (n = 105)	17.78% (n = 24)	1.48% (n = 2)	2.96% (n = 4)
2 year Colleges (n = 169)	89.35% (n = 151)	1.18% (n = 2)	0%	9.47% (n = 16)

χ^2 (15, N= 613) = 229.324, p < .001

Note. Seminar Type A = Extented Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars. Thirty percent of cells have counts less than 5. Chi-square may not be a valid test.

freshman programming. Liberal Arts I and II colleges, on the other hand, are often quite different from each other in terms of selectivity and overall institutional character. Therefore, Liberal Arts I and II categories were retained for data analysis.

As Table 17 indicates, Liberal Arts I institutions (highly selective) are more likely than any other Carnegie type to choose academic, rather than extended orientation or basic study skills seminars. The research university is the second most common site for academic seminars.

However, an equal number of research universities offer extended orientation seminars. For all other Carnegie classifications (Doctorate-Granting, Comprehensive, Liberal Arts II, and Two-year Colleges), more extended orientation seminars are offered than all other seminar types combined.

Size (Table 18) and ethnic diversity (Table 19) of an institution's undergraduate population are less likely to be discriminating factors in the type of freshman seminar offered, although differences between categories on these two dimensions were statistically significant at the

Table 18

Type of Freshman Seminar by Size of Institution's Undergraduate Student Population (N = 668)

Size of Student Population	Seminar Type A (n = 493)	B (n = 84)	C (n = 49)	D (n = 42)
Under 1,000 (n = 153)	75.16% (n = 115)	14.38% (n = 22)	1.31% (n = 2)	9.15% (n = 14)
1,001 to 5,000 (n = 329)	71.73% (n = 236)	13.98% (n = 46)	10.03% (n = 43)	4.26% (n = 14)
5,001 to 10,000 (n = 82)	80.49% (n = 66)	9.76% (n = 8)	4.88% (n = 4)	4.88% (n = 4)
10,001 to 20,000 (n = 72)	70.83% (n = 51)	8.33% (n = 6)	11.11% (n = 8)	9.52% (n = 7)
Over 20,000 (n = 32)	78.13% (n = 25)	6.25% (n = 2)	6.25% (n = 2)	9.38% (n = 3)

χ^2 (12, N = 668) = 23.587, p<.05

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

Table 19

Type of Freshman Seminar by Ethnic Diversity of Institution (N = 660)

	Seminar Type A (n = 255)	B (n = 34)	C (n = 16)	D (n = 22)
Over 90% of undergraduates are of one ethnic group (e.g., white, black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander). (n = 327)	77.98% (n = 255)	10.40% (n = 34)	4.89% (n = 16)	6.73% (n = 22)
From 75 to 90% of undergraduates are of one ethnic group. (n = 234)	68.38% (n = 160)	16.24% (n = 38)	10.68% (n = 25)	4.70% (n = 11)
No one ethnic group comprises more than 75% of the undergraduate population. (n = 99)	74.75% (n = 74)	10.10% (n = 10)	7.07% (n = 7)	8.08% (n = 8)

χ^2 (6, N = 660) = 13.810, p<.05

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

.05 level. Institutions with an undergraduate population between 1001 and 5000 students reported the largest percentage of academic seminars, as did institutions that are moderately diverse (from 75 to 90% of students are of one ethnic group).

Research Question #IV

How do freshman seminars differ by type according to the variables listed in Research Question #IIB (Items 1 - 11)?

1. Goals. Responding institutions reported a total of 21 goals for freshman seminars. Table 20 lists the eight most frequently reported goals by seminar type in descending order of frequency. Other reported goals included "help students feel connected to institution," "increase

Table 20

Course Goals by Type of Freshman Seminar in Descending Order of Frequency

Seminar Type			
Extended Orientation ($n = 494$)	Common Academic Content ($n = 84$)	Various Academic Content ($n = 49$)	Basic Study Skills ($n = 42$)
Develop academic skills (229)	Develop academic skills (60)	Develop academic skills (28)	Develop academic skills (31)
Provide knowledge of campus resources (187)	Introduce general/liberal arts education (27)	Provide opportunity for interaction with faculty (16)	Increase likelihood of college success (15)
Ease transition from high school to college (164)	Ease transition from high school to college (13)	Provide common educational experience (10)	Ease transition from high school to college (7)
Develop major and career plans (152)	Provide common educational experience (12)	Improve academic advising (9)	Provide opportunity for student self-evaluation (7)
Increase likelihood of college success (148)	Increase likelihood of college success (10)	Introduce the purpose of higher education (9)	Provide knowledge of campus resources (7)
Provide opportunity for student self-evaluation (98)	Introduce the purpose of higher education (10)	Introduce general education (8)	Increase retention (5)
Develop a student support group (81)	Introduce the disciplines (10)	Introduce the disciplines (8)	Develop major and career plans (4)
Help students feel connected to institution (76)	Provide opportunity for student self-evaluation (10)	Provide opportunity for student self-evaluation (8)	Improve academic advising (2)

Note. For each seminar type, the table includes only the top eight of 21 reported goals. Percentages were not calculated because all responding institutions did not answer this question.

student involvement," "create campus community," "develop values and ethics," "develop leadership skills," "develop religious values."

As Table 20 indicates, the most frequently reported goal for all seminar types was "develop academic skills." Survey results indicated that this broad goal was implemented in a variety of ways depending on entering students' academic abilities and desired course outcomes. "Ease transition from high school to college," and "increase likelihood of college success" were other broad goals that were among the five most frequently reported for all seminar types.

It should be noted that, in spite of dramatic differences in specific course structure and content, basic goals are remarkably consistent across seminar types. These goals support the overall definition of the freshman seminar (page 49) as a course which "is intended to enhance the academic and/or social integration of first-year students."

2. *Content.* Responding institutions reported a total of 26 topics which comprise the content of the freshman seminar. Table 21 presents the top ten topics by seminar type in descending order of frequency for the three freshman seminar types which have common content across sections. Other reported topics were "leadership," "money management," "conflict resolution," "decision making," "importance of involvement," "religion and spirituality."

As was expected, topics selected for freshman seminars generally correspond to the overall intent of the seminar. Topics for seminars with common academic content are more oriented to academic themes or subjects, although the development of academic skills (critical thinking and writing, basic study skills) is also a component of such seminars. Some freshman seminars, in which the primary focus is reported to be

Table 21

Topics that Comprise the Content of Freshman Seminars by Type of Seminar in Descending Order of Frequency

Seminar Type		
Extended Orientation ($n = 494$)	Common Academic Content ($n = 84$)	Basic Study Skills ($n = 42$)
Basic study skills (336)	Liberal arts/general education (25)	Basic study skills (32)
Time management (209)	Cultural diversity (25)	Time management (26)
Campus facilities and resources (155)	Critical thinking and writing (20)	Critical thinking and writing (7)
Wellness (alcohol/drug abuse, STDs, nutrition (120)	Current societal issues (20)	Self knowledge/awareness/ discipline/evaluation (7)
Campus rules and regulations (105)	Basic study skills (14)	Using the library (7)
Relationships-includes date rape (104)	Classic books (14)	Goal setting (5)
Self knowledge/awareness/ discipline/evaluation (92)	Disciplinary ways of thinking (13)	Relationship issues-includes date rape (4)
Goal setting (63)	Purpose of higher education (13)	Wellness (alcohol/drugs/STDs) (3)
Using the library (47)	Values clarification (12)	Campus facilities and resources (2)
History and mission of institution (42)	Self knowledge/awareness/disc./eval. (12)	Oral communication (1)

Note. This table lists the 10 most frequently reported topics that comprise the content of the three freshman seminar types with common content across sections.

Percentages were not calculated because all responding institutions did not answer this question.

basic study skills, also address current issues such as relationships and wellness. This finding again substantiates the observation that many seminars have a primary focus but also become a forum for addressing other issues of concern to students and to the campus.

It is interesting that extended orientation and basic study skills seminars are almost identical in terms of the range of topics covered. This finding raises questions about whether there are significant differences between these two seminar types.

3. Structure.

a. maximum allowable enrollments. Table 22 presents findings on maximum allowable seminar enrollments by seminar type. The most common maximum class enrollment for all seminar types is from 16 to 25 students. However, extended orientation courses are more likely than other seminar types to enroll over 25 students. A larger proportion of academic seminars whether of consistent or variable content are likely to qualify as "seminars" in terms of small group size. It can be argued, based on this finding, that those who design academic seminars are more concerned with replicating the seminar form than those who design orientation or basic study skills "seminars."

b. grading. Table 23 presents findings by seminar type on whether freshman seminars are graded by a letter grade or pass/fail. A clear majority of all freshman seminars, irrespective of type, are graded by a letter grade. As might be expected, the percentage of letter-graded seminars is greatest in the two academic seminar categories. Anecdotal evidence indicates that many educators question whether students can be fairly "graded" on the kinds of information which comprise the content of extended orientation seminars.

Table 22

Maximum Seminar Enrollments by Type of Seminar (N = 643)

		Seminar Type			
		A (n = 472)	B (n = 82)	C (n = 48)	D (n = 41)
Maximum Allowable Enrollment	Up to 15 (n = 103)	12.08% (n = 57)	29.27% (n = 24)	41.67% (n = 24)	4.88% (n = 2)
	16 to 25 (n = 335)	50.85% (n = 240)	52.44% (n = 43)	56.25% (n = 27)	60.98% (n = 25)
	26 to 40 (n = 131)	21.82% (n = 103)	15.85% (n = 13)	2.08% (n = 1)	34.15% (n = 14)
	41 and up (n = 74)	15.25% (n = 72)	2.44% (n = 2)	0	0

$\chi^2(9, N = 643) = 72.242, p<.001$

Note. A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

Table 23

Freshman Seminar Grading by Type of Seminar (N = 648)

		Seminar Type			
		A (n = 480)	B (n = 82)	C (n = 47)	D (n = 39)
Grading Method	Pass/Fail (n = 207)	36.04% (n = 173)	20.73% (n = 17)	14.89% (n = 7)	25.64% (n = 10)
	Letter Grade (n = 441)	63.96% (n = 307)	79.27% (n = 65)	85.11% (n = 40)	74.36% (n = 29)

$\chi^2(3, N = 648) = 15.447, p<.001$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

c. whether freshman seminar is a required course. Table 24 presents findings by seminar type on which, if any, students are required to take the freshman seminar. The freshman seminar type most likely to be *required for all students* is the academic seminar with common content across sections. This finding was expected since this seminar type is often the centerpiece of a core curriculum. The seminar type most likely to be *required for some students* is the basic study skills seminar. Additional survey findings indicated that students required to take such a seminar are almost always those with acknowledged academic deficiencies. Again, there is nothing surprising about this finding. The seminar type which is most likely to be an *elective for all students* is the academic seminar with content that varies by section. Both Harvard University and the University of California-Davis offer such

Table 24

Who is Required to Take the Freshman Seminar by Type of Seminar (N = 664)

		Seminar Type			
		A (n = 489)	B (n = 84)	C (n = 49)	D (n = 42)
Required For	All Students (n = 567)	45.19% (n = 411)	65.48% (n = 81)	28.57% (n = 48)	11.90% (n = 27)
	Some Students (n = 179)	26.99% (n = 132)	21.43% (n = 18)	10.20% (n = 5)	57.14% (n = 24)
	No Students (n = 190)	27.81% (n = 136)	13.10% (n = 11)	61.22% (n = 30)	30.95% (n = 13)

χ^2 (6, N = 664) = 66.935, p<.001

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

seminars and report that they are often oversubscribed by students. At both institutions, students apply to take the seminar of their choice, but because class size is limited to around 15 students, many students are unable to enroll.

d. credit. Tables 25 and 26 present findings on whether the freshman seminar carries academic credit, and, if so, the number of credit hours. Although the overwhelming majority of all freshman seminars carry academic credit, basic study skills seminars (often considered remedial courses) are less likely than other types to carry such credit. As Table 26 indicates, over 50% of extended orientation seminars carry one semester hour of credit. Academic seminars with common content are more likely to carry three semester hours of credit. Seminars that carry more than three semester hours of credit are most

Table 25

Academic Credit/No Credit by Type of Seminar (N = 662)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 489)	B (n = 83)	C (n = 49)	D (n = 41)
Academic credit (n = 567)	84.05% (n = 411)	97.59% (n = 81)	97.96% (n = 48)	65.85% (n = 27)
No academic credit (n = 95)	15.95% (n = 78)	2.41% (n = 2)	2.04% (n = 1)	34.15% (n = 14)

χ^2 (3, N = 662) = 66.935, p <.001

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

Table 26

Credit Hours Carried by Type of Seminar (N = 567)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 415)	B (n = 80)	C (n = 47)	D (n = 28)
1 semester hour (n = 258)	54.22% (n = 225)	22.50% (n = 18)	8.51% (n = 4)	39.29% (n = 11)
2 semester hours (n = 77)	15.42% (n = 64)	3.75% (n = 3)	4.26% (n = 2)	28.57% (n = 8)
3 semester hours (n = 107)	14.94% (n = 62)	33.75% (n = 27)	21.28% (n = 10)	28.57% (n = 8)
More than 3 sem. hours (n = 32)	0.24% (n = 1)	21.25% (n = 17)	29.79% (n = 14)	0.00%
Quarter hours (n = 63)	12.77% (n = 53)	10.00% (n = 8)	2.13% (n = 1)	3.57% (n = 1)
Other (n = 33)	2.41% (n = 10)	8.75% (n = 7)	34.04% (n = 16)	0.00%

$\chi^2(15, N = 567) = 248.087$, $p < .001$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars. Thirty-three percent of cells have counts less than 5. Chi-square may not be a valid test.

likely to be academic, with either common or various content. These courses often comprise two semesters.

Again, actual findings were consistent with those expected. As the level of freshman seminars moves on a continuum from remedial to advanced, and as content moves from orientation to traditional academic content, numbers of credit hours carried by these courses increase.

e. application of credit. Table 27 presents findings on the application of academic credit to various credit categories (i. e., core

requirements, general education, major requirements, electives, other) by seminar type. The clear majority of credit-bearing extended orientation and basic study skills seminars carry elective credit. Academic seminars with common content are generally either part of a core requirement or carry general education credit. Academic seminars with various content are most likely to carry either general education or elective credit. Few seminars of any type count toward requirements for the major.

Table 27

Application of Credit by Type of Seminar (N = 568)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 413)	B (n = 81)	C (n = 46)	D (n = 28)
Core Requirement (n = 105)	15.74% (n = 65)	34.57% (n = 28)	19.57% (n = 9)	10.71% (n = 3)
General Educ Reqmt. (n = 165)	26.15% (n = 108)	45.68% (n = 37)	36.96% (n = 17)	10.71% (n = 3)
Elective (n = 264)	52.30% (n = 216)	14.81% (n = 12)	32.61% (n = 15)	75.00% (n = 21)
Major Requirement (n = 10)	0.97% (n = 4)	4.94% (n = 2)	4.35% (n = 2)	0.00%
Other (n = 24)	4.84% (n = 20)	0.00%	6.52% (n = 3)	3.57% (n = 1)

$\chi^2(12, N = 568) = 67.144, p < .001$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars. Thirty percent of cells have counts less than 5. Chi-square may not be a valid test.

In the "pecking order" of credits, core or major requirements can be considered most important. Next come courses that count toward general education requirements, and finally are the free electives. The findings for this question relative to a "credit pecking order" were as expected. Academic seminars with consistent content were more likely to count as either core, major, or general education requirements, and with few exceptions, basic study skills seminars carried elective credit.

4. *Instructors.* Table 28 provides data which indicates, by seminar type, who teaches freshman seminars. It should be noted that these

Table 28

Instructors by Type of Seminar (N = 667)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 492)	B (n = 84)	C (n= 49)	D (n = 42)
Faculty* (n = 561)	81.10% (n = 399)	98.81% (n = 83)	100.00% (n = 49)	71.43% (n = 30)
Student affairs professionals* (n = 342)	63.01% (n = 310)	22.62% (n = 19)	4.08% (n = 2)	26.19% (n = 11)
Other campus administrators* (n = 231)	39.02% (n = 192)	23.81% (n = 20)	18.37% (n = 9)	23.81% (n = 10)
Upper-level undergraduate students (n = 55)	9.76% (n = 48)	5.95% (n = 5)	0.00%	4.76% (n = 2)
Graduate students (n = 28)	4.47% (n = 22)	3.57% (n = 3)	0.00%	7.14% (n = 3)
Other** (n = 68)	11.38% (n = 56)	5.95% (n = 5)	0.00%	16.67% (n = 7)

*p < .001, **p < .05.

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars. Because of small cell sizes, chi-square may not be a valid test.

instructor categories are not mutually exclusive. Large freshman seminar programs may employ all categories of instructors in order to staff multiple classes.

As Table 28 indicates, faculty teach the clear majority of freshman seminars of all types. Student affairs professionals, other campus administrators, undergraduate and graduate students are more likely to teach an extended orientation seminar than other seminar types. In the category "Other" were included adjunct faculty, alumni, trustees, and private citizens.

In analyzing this survey finding, it is interesting to note that professional and administrative staff, in addition to students, are involved in freshman seminar instruction. It is reasonable to argue that no other type of college course utilizes as wide a variety of instructors as the freshman seminar. Again, it cannot be assumed that these individuals necessarily want to teach this course. Freshman seminar instruction may be a unrewarded requirement for either faculty, staff, or students.

5. *Instructional activities.* Responding institutions reported a total of 25 discrete instructional activities for freshman seminars. Table 29 provides information on the top 12 such activities in descending order of frequency by type of seminar. Other reported instructional activities were "required campus events," "placement testing," "panel discussions," "interviews," "debates," "community service," "events at instructors' homes," "book reviews," and "mock trials."

Table 29 indicates that there was little variance between seminar types in the 12 most frequently reported instructional activities. Lecture was the most commonly reported instructional activity for both extended

Table 29

Instructional Activities by Type of Freshman Seminar in Descending Order of Frequency

Seminar Type			
Extended Orientation (n = 494)	Common Academic Content (n = 84)	Various Academic Content (n = 49)	Basic Study Skills (n = 42)
Lecture (405)	Class discussion (75)	Class discussion (40)	Lecture (32)
Class discussion (380)	Lecture (52)	Lecture (22)	Class discussion (26)
Group projects (245)	Group projects (34)	Group projects (19)	Group projects (20)
Guest lectures (138)	Film/video presentations (19)	Written assignments (18)	Guest lectures (10)
Film/video presentations (133)	Student presentations (17)	Student presentations (17)	Film/video presentations (9)
Student presentations (67)	Retreats/conferences (13)	Film/video presentations (14)	Written assignments (4)
Written assignments (63)	Student journals (11)	Retreats/conferences (7)	Quizzes (4)
Campus tours (55)	Cultural events (10)	Guest lectures (6)	Campus tours (4)
Student journals (50)	Drama/role playing (6)	Campus tours (6)	Computer instruction (3)
Retreats/conferences (44)	Guest lectures (5)	Student journals (5)	Academic advising (3)
Drama/role playing (41)	Academic advising (5)	Cultural events (4)	Peer tutoring (3)
Academic advising (30)	Peer tutoring (5)	Peer tutoring (4)	Learning styles inventories (2)

Note. For each seminar type, this table includes the top 12 of 25 reported instructional activities. Percentages were not calculated because all responding institutions did not answer this question.

orientation and basic study skills seminars, although numerous respondents indicated that the lecture was used infrequently or was, in essence, a "mini-lecture." Class discussion was the most frequently reported activity for the two academic seminar types.

The findings indicate that freshman seminars use the same instructional activities as other traditional classes. If a difference exists, it may be that freshman seminars tend to allocate more classroom time to the more non-traditional types of activities such as drama, role playing, and attending cultural events.

6. Evaluation. As Table 30 indicates, the outcome measured most frequently across all seminar types was "student opinion of/satisfaction with course/instructor." This outcome is commonly measured by routine end-of-semester course evaluations. "Persistence to the sophomore year" a reported outcome of freshman orientation seminars (Fidler & Hunter, 1989), is, according to this survey, now measured for over 45% of orientation seminars. But surprisingly, this outcome, in addition to "persistence to graduation," "use of campus services," and "friendships among seminar classmates," is also being measured with respect to other seminar types. The chi-square statistics show no significant differences between seminar types on the measurement of these four outcomes. This finding indicates that, even in the absence of substantiating research, administrators of academic and basic study skills seminars want to know what impact their particular freshman seminar might have on these variables. Other than the four most frequently reported possible outcomes (see Table 30), few freshman seminars of any type are evaluated with respect to other outcomes. Either the majority of institutions have no interest in tracking additional

outcomes, or they have no individual on the faculty or staff with the skill or interest in designing such evaluation procedures.

7. Longevity. As Table 31 and the relevant chi-square statistic indicate, there are no statistically significant differences between seminar

Table 30

Outcomes Measured by Type of Seminar (N = 665)

	Seminar Type A (n = 492)	B (n = 84)	C (n = 48)	D (n = 41)
Student opinion of/satisfaction with course/instructor** (n =445)	66.67% (n = 328)	75.00% (n = 63)	69.39% (n = 34)	48.78% (n = 20)
Persistence to sophomore year (n = 284)	45.33% (n = 223)	33.33% (n = 28)	38.78% (n = 19)	34.15% (n = 14)
Content knowledge* (n = 239)	34.76% (n = 171)	51.19% (n = 43)	29.17% (n = 14)	26.83% (n = 11)
Persistence to graduation (n = 191)	29.27% (n = 144)	29.76% (n = 25)	26.53% (n = 13)	21.95% (n = 9)
Student use of campus services (n = 111)	18.09% (n = 89)	10.71% (n = 9)	10.20% (n = 5)	19.51% (n = 8)
Student participation in campus activities** (n = 104)	18.09% (n = 89)	7.14% (n = 6)	12.24% (n = 6)	7.32% (n = 3)
Out-of-class interaction with faculty* (n = 69)	10.16% (n = 50)	10.71% (n = 9)	20.41% (n = 10)	0.00%
Friendships among seminar classmates (n = 69)	10.16% (n = 50)	11.90% (n = 10)	16.33% (n = 8)	2.44% (n = 1)
Other* (n = 43)	5.08% (n = 25)	11.90% (n = 10)	14.29% (n = 7)	2.44% (n = 1)

*p < .01, **p < .05.

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars. Because of small cell sizes, chi-square may not be a valid test.

Table 31

Longevity of Freshman Seminars by Type of Seminar (N = 626)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 460)	B (n = 77)	C (n = 48)	D (n = 41)
Under 2 years (n = 145)	23.26% (n = 107)	24.68% (n = 19)	20.83% (n = 10)	21.95% (n = 9)
From 2 to 5 years (n = 224)	36.96% (n = 170)	29.87% (n = 23)	22.92% (n = 11)	48.78% (n = 20)
From 6 to 10 years (n = 140)	22.39% (n = 103)	19.48% (n = 15)	29.17% (n = 14)	19.51% (n = 8)
From 11 to 20 years (n = 91)	13.70% (n = 63)	16.88% (n = 13)	22.92% (n = 11)	9.76% (n = 4)
Over 20 years (n = 26)	3.70% (n = 17)	9.09% (n = 7)	4.17% (n = 2)	0.00%

$\chi^2(12, N = 626) = 16.664, p$=ns

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

types in terms of their longevity. Most seminars in all categories are products of the last ten years. Only 17.4% of extended orientation seminars, 26% of both academic seminar types, and 9.76% of basic study skills seminars have been offered for more than ten years.

This finding is somewhat contrary to prior expectations. Although orientation and basic study skills seminars are known to have proliferated recently because they are reputed to enhance retention, the fact that numbers of academic freshman seminars have increased dramatically was unexpected. This finding indicates that freshman

seminars are currently being employed for reasons other than the enhancement of student retention. Such reasons likely include the creation of a common academic experience and a more intentional introduction to the academic expectations of higher education.

8. Administration. Tables 32, 33, and 34 provide information by seminar type on (a) the academic unit that has content responsibility for the freshman seminar, (b) whether there is an official director, and (c) that individual's status as a faculty member or administrator.

As Table 32 indicates, academic units at various levels have content responsibility for the majority of freshman seminars of all types. As was expected, the data show that student affairs divisions are most likely to have content responsibility for extended orientation seminars but highly unlikely to have such responsibility for other seminar types. The frequency of responses for the category "Other" indicates that there was considerable variance of responses, especially in the category "academic seminars with various content." Table 32 lists the eight most frequent responses out of a possible 17. Other campus units reported were "retention department," "admissions office," and "president's office,"

As shown in Table 33, the majority of freshman seminars have an official director with the exception of basic study skills seminars. In the basic study skills category, fewer than 50% of seminar programs have a director.

It is clear from the data in Table 34 that faculty members are most frequently the directors of freshman seminars of any type. Student affairs professionals are more likely to serve as directors of extended orientation seminars than of other types. Again, these findings are consistent with prior expectations.

Table 32

Campus Unit With Freshman Seminar Content Responsibility by Type of Seminar

Seminar Type			
Extended Orientation ($n = 494$)	Common Academic Content ($n = 84$)	Various Academic Content ($n = 49$)	Basic Study Skills ($n = 42$)
Student affairs (98)	Academic college (other than university/general college) (21)	Other (15)	Academic dept (other than English, psyc./social science) (13)
Academic college (other than university/general college) (62)	Task force or committee (16)	Task force or committee (10)	Academic skills/learning skills office (6)
Provost/academic affairs office (51)	Provost/academic affairs office (10)	Academic college (other than university/general college) (9)	Academic college (other than university/general college) (5)
Acad. dept (other than English, psyc./social science) (47)	Other (10)	Provost/academic affairs office (6)	Other (4)
Academic skills/learning skills office (42)	English department/writing program (7)	Acad. dept (other than English, psyc./social science) (6)	Freshman year experience/ freshman studies office (3)
Task force or committee (41)	Freshman year experience/ freshman studies office (5)	English department/writing program (2)	Student affairs (2)
Guidance and counseling office (38)	Acad. dept (other than English, psyc./social science) (5)	Honors program (1)	Provost/academic affairs office (2)
	Student affairs (2)		Psychology/soc. science dept (2)

Note. This table includes the eight campus units most frequently mentioned by responders. Percentages were not calculated because all responding institutions did not answer this question.

Table 33

Whether There is a Freshman Seminar Director by Type of Seminar (N = 663)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 490)	B (n = 84)	C (n = 48)	D (n = 41)
Yes (n = 482)	72.24% (n = 354)	85.71% (n = 72)	77.08% (n = 37)	46.34% (n = 19)
No (n = 181)	27.76% (n = 136)	14.29% (n = 12)	22.92% (n = 11)	53.66% (n = 22)

$\chi^2(3, N = 663) = 22.037,\ p < .001$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

9. Academic Advising. Table 35 provides data on whether the freshman seminar instructor serves as academic advisor for all, some, or none of his/her seminar students. Only in academic seminars with various content, do the majority of instructors serve as academic advisors for all or some students. For all other seminar types, fewer than 50% of freshman seminar instructors serve as academic advisors for any students in their seminar classes.

The particular way that academic advising is accomplished on a single campus depends on a number of factors which are beyond the scope of this study. It is reasonable to assume that on campuses where students are encouraged to declare a major upon entry or within the freshman year, the responsibility for advising belongs to faculty or

Table 34

Faculty Status/Administrative Position of Freshman Seminar Directors by Type of Seminar

Seminar Type			
Extended Orientation ($n = 494$)	Common Academic Content ($n = 84$)	Various Academic Content ($n = 49$)	Basic Study Skills ($n = 42$)
Faculty (148)	Faculty (51)	Faculty (18)	Faculty (11)
Student affairs administrator (83)	Academic dean (12)	Academic dean (14)	Director of learning center (5)
Academic dean (53)	Director/dean of freshman programs (5)	Director/dean of freshman programs (4)	Academic dean (2)
Director of guidance and counseling (34)	Other (3)	Student affairs administrator (2)	Director/dean of freshman programs (2)
Other (20)	Student affairs administrator (1)	Other (2)	Other (1)
Director/dean of freshman programs (15)			
Director of learning center (12)			

Note. Percentages were not calculated because all responding institutions did not answer this question.

Table 35

Whether the Freshman Seminar Instructor is the Student's Academic Advisor by Type of Seminar (N = 659)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 489)	B (n = 83)	C (n = 49)	D (n = 38)
Instructor advises all seminar students (n = 147)	20.45% (n = 100)	32.53% (n = 27)	34.69% (n = 17)	7.89% (n = 3)
Instructor advises some seminar students (n = 142)	22.70% (n = 111)	10.84% (n = 9)	24.49% (n = 12)	26.32% (n = 10)
Instructor does not advise seminar students (n = 370)	56.85% (n = 278)	56.63% (n = 47)	40.82% (n = 20)	65.79% (n = 25)

$\chi^2(6, N = 659) = 19.593$, $p < .01$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

professional advisors within specific departments. On campuses where students are allowed to delay choice of major, centralized advising through a general college or perhaps through a freshman seminar is more likely.

10. Instructor training. Tables 36 and 37 provide survey findings by seminar type on whether institutions offer or require some form of specific training for freshman seminar instructors. The majority of freshman seminars of all types offer training for seminar instructors. However, training is most commonly offered for instructors of academic seminars with common content (81.71%) and extended orientation seminars (72.99%). Likewise training is most often required for

Table 36

Whether Instructor Training is Offered by Type of Seminar (N = 656)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 485)	B (n = 82)	C (n = 49)	D (n = 40)
Yes (n = 471)	72.99% (n = 354)	81.71% (n = 67)	59.18% (n = 29)	52.50% (n = 21)
No (n = 185)	27.01% (n = 131)	18.29% (n = 15)	40.82% (n = 20)	47.50% (n = 19)

$\chi^2(3, N = 656) = 15.524,\ p < .01$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

Table 37

Whether Instructor Training is Required by Type of Seminar (N = 649)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 481)	B (n = 80)	C (n = 47)	D (n = 41)
Yes (n = 309)	48.65% (n = 234)	66.25% (n = 53)	21.28% (n = 10)	29.27% (n = 12)
No (n = 340)	51.35% (n = 247)	33.75% (n = 27)	78.72% (n = 37)	70.73% (n = 29)

$\chi^2(3, N = 649) = 29.948,\ p < .001$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

instructors of academic seminars with common content (66.25%) and extended orientation seminars (48.65%).

These findings indicate that as the content of a freshman seminar departs from a single discipline, the perceived necessity of instructor training increases. Academic seminars with common content are often interdisciplinary courses which focus on a single theme from a variety of perspectives. Such courses are generally designed by a faculty team, and anecdotal evidence indicates that faculty become involved in training designed to assist them in teaching an interdisciplinary course. Orientation seminars often address sensitive topics and campus issues about which faculty may have little prior knowledge. Finally, all instructors of freshman seminars in which attention to group process is a goal can likely benefit from extra help in methods of group facilitation.

11. Institutional support (from students, faculty, and administrators). Table 38 provides a comparison by seminar type of the degree of overall institutional support for freshman seminars. As this table indicates, the highest levels of overall campus support for freshman seminars were reported for academic seminars of either common or various content. The seminar type that was reported to have the least campus support is the basic study skills seminar. It is reasonable to assume, based on these findings, that while colleges and universities support the freshman seminar concept, they are less supportive of remedial courses. For some campuses, remediation is perhaps a necessary evil.

The question that elicited these findings asked for responders' opinions about overall campus support. Findings, therefore, may be biased in either a positive or a negative direction by the individual responder's personal perceptions.

Table 38

Overall Campus Support For Freshman Seminar by Type of Seminar (N = 663)

	Seminar Type			
	A (n = 490)	B (n = 83)	C (n = 49)	D (n = 41)
Low (n = 48)	7.15% (n = 35)	4.81% (n = 4)	6.12% (n = 3)	14.64% (n = 6)
Neutral (n = 185)	31.02% (n = 152)	16.87% (n = 14)	14.29% (n = 7)	29.27% (n = 12)
High (n = 430)	61.83% (n = 303)	78.32% (n = 65)	79.59% (n = 39)	56.10% (n = 23)

$\chi^2(12, N = 663) = 21.451,\ p < .05$

Note. Seminar Type A = Extended Orientation Seminars, Type B = Academic Seminars With Common Content Across Sections, Type C = Academic Seminars on Various Topics, Type D = Basic Study Skills Seminars.

Summary

This chapter has provided answers to the four main research questions and their components. Briefly, the freshman seminar is a course designed to facilitate the academic or social integration of first-year students through a variety of educational topics, instructional activities, and course structures. There are at least five discrete types of freshman seminar courses in American higher education: the extended orientation seminar, the academic seminar with common content across sections, the academic seminar with content which varies by section, the professional seminar, and the basic study skills seminar. Many seminars combine characteristics of several of these discrete types.

The overwhelming majority of freshman seminars in American higher education are extended orientation seminars taught in sections of up to 25 students. These courses are most likely to receive one credit hour of elective credit and to be graded by a letter grade.

Other seminar types do exist in significant numbers. Those that focus on academic content are more likely to be found in highly selective institutions. All seminar types are taught primarily by faculty members, although other educators (student affairs professionals, campus administrators, graduate and upper-level undergraduate students) also serve as seminar instructors. The majority of freshman seminar programs of all types offer faculty training to prospective instructors, but fewer institutions require that instructors be trained in order to teach the freshman seminar.

Approximately 24% of freshman seminars are no more than two years old, and approximately 81% are no more than ten years old. Generally, overall campus support for freshman seminars of all types is reported to be quite good. Only a small percentage of institutions reported low levels of campus support.

Chapter 5 will present an in-depth analysis of model freshman seminars of each type and will explore 16 of the 17 seminars categorized as "Other." Finally, unintended survey findings will be highlighted.

CHAPTER 5

Qualitative Findings

Introduction

Freshman seminars share a number of common characteristics which can be studied and analyzed quantitatively. However, many of these courses, irrespective of type, also have unique features or components which become lost in quantitative analysis. Up to this point, this study has dissected the freshman seminar into its various elements and quantitatively compared those elements. The purpose of this chapter is to present a qualitative analysis of both model freshman seminars in each defined category and of 16 of the 17 freshman seminars that were categorized "Other." Finally, this chapter reviews unintentional survey findings drawn from responder comments. These comments were either written on the survey instrument itself or in letters which were appended to the survey.

The Extended Orientation Seminar: Ohio State University

The extended orientation seminar accounts for approximately 70% of freshman seminars in American higher education. Many excellent models have been reported by survey respondents including the seminar entitled "University Survey" which has been offered at Ohio State University, a Carnegie Research I institution, for the past 75 years. As might be expected, the Ohio State freshman seminar has undergone a number of changes since its inception (Gordon, 1991). Today it is administered through the University College in conjunction with each

degree-granting unit and is required of all Ohio State freshmen (n = 5000) except the several hundred students who are directly enrolled in the College of Engineering.

In order to accomodate this large number of students, the freshman seminar is offered in approximately 300 sections per year taught by professional staff members (not faculty) or half-time graduate students who also serve as the students' academic advisors. Instructor training is required of all freshman seminar instructors. Students are assigned to a section of the freshman seminar depending on their choice of major. Section format, therefore, varies from large lecture/recitation to small seminar depending on the total number of first-year students selecting a particular major. The course is graded and carries one quarter hour of either elective or required credit, depending on the major department.

The following three primary course goals were reported:

1. To introduce the nature of a university;
2. To inform students about policies and rules of Ohio State;
3. To help students learn about the curriculum of their stated interest, or to explore plausible career and academic majors.

Course content generally corresponds to goals but also includes a focus on contemporary issues such as AIDS and racial and gender equality. An in-house publication entitled *University Survey: A Guidebook for New Students* is the only required course text.

Measured outcomes of the course include "content knowledge," "student satisfaction with the course and instructor," "use of campus services," and "student participation in campus activities." As the longevity of this course would indicate, it is reported to enjoy a "high"

level of support from across the campus and a strong likelihood that it will be offered for the foreseeable future.

The Ohio State freshman seminar parallels other extended orientation seminars with respect to overall goals, topics addressed, and certain structural elements such as class size and number of credit hours awarded. However, this course is unique among other orientation seminars with respect to its age, its status as a required course, and its use of no regular faculty members as "instructors of record" for the course. Very few large universities can staff sufficient sections of a freshman seminar to require it of all entering students, and most freshman seminars of any type use at least some faculty members as instructors.

The Academic Seminar with Common Course Content Across Sections: St. Lawrence University

Academic seminars with common content across all sections accounted for 12.62% of all freshman seminars reported in the Second National Survey. Almost 50% of these courses were offered at Liberal Arts I and Liberal Arts II colleges, and 53% of them were reported to carry "over three semester hours" of credit.

The freshman seminar offered for five years at St. Lawrence University represents this seminar type. Sections of this course are taught only by faculty members in classrooms that are located within nine residential colleges. The course was designed to integrate academic advising, academic content, and residential life and has been titled "The Human Condition: Nature, Self, and Society." Course themes are the following:

1. The making of community and the human experience;

2. The natural world and the human experience;
3. Gender, race, and class;
4. Identity and self-development;
5. Globalism and environmentalism.

Students read a number of classic texts including Plato's *Republic*, Hobbes's *Leviathan*, Marx's *The Communist Manifesto*, and Locke's *Second Treatise on Government* which become the basis for small group discussion, writing assignments, and "mock trials."

St. Lawrence's freshman seminar is a two-semester course which counts as a general education requirement. Instructor training is required for faculty instructors, and the instructor serves as academic advisor for all students in his or her class. This freshman seminar is reported to enjoy a high level of overall campus support and solid prospects for future continuation.

This freshman seminar is highly representative of other academic seminars with common content that are offered at small liberal arts colleges. Many such seminars are integrated into residence life programming, are central to a core curriculum, and are two-semester courses.

Another adaptation of this seminar type, however, tends to be found at larger universities. Such courses will often be required for all entering students and will focus on a single theme or topic across all sections, but they generally carry no more than three hours of general education or elective credit. California State University, Long Beach, offers such a seminar which is essentially a course on the history of American higher education. The director of this freshman seminar has developed a book of readings for this course which includes many standard readings of

higher education literature as well as a variety of articles about current higher education issues. Such courses are often initiated in the attempt to give students on a large campus at least one common educational experience in the absence of a core curriculum.

Academic Seminars on Various Topics:

University of California, Davis

This variation of the freshman seminar comprises 7.3% of seminars nationwide and is offered almost exclusively at institutions that are of moderate or high selectivity. Liberal Arts I and Research I institutions account for 65% of such courses. The range of topics covered in these academic seminars is virtually limitless and usually reflects the particular research or scholarship interests of the faculty who teach them.

In the 1991-1992 academic year at the University of California, Davis, the following 22 seminars were offered:

- Why Do Some People Want Nonhuman Animals to Have Rights?
- Archaeology and the History of Food
- Toxics in the Environment: Science and Public Policy
- Comparative Studies of Law and Social Control
- Tropical Rain Forests: Romance and Reality
- From Laboratory Research to Patient Care
- Vegetarianism from Antiquity to Modern Times
- The Play's the Thing
- Ethics in American Life
- Essential Great Books
- Restaging the Trial of Galileo

- Landscapes of Mars: Warfare as a Mechanism in Landscape Change
- Public Perception of Risk
- The Legacy of Greece and Rome
- Evaluating Controversial Claims
- Waiting for the Big One: Earthquake Preparedness in California
- Japanese Religion: Diversity Harmonized
- The Many Faces of Faust
- Visions of Mars: War in Film, Music, and Poetry-Literature
- How Do You Know What You Know?
- Photography of Wilderness: History and Practice
- Critical Thinking and the Theatre Process: What Makes for an Educated Audience

These seminars meet for eight weeks during each quarter, and classes are taught both on campus and in the instructors' homes. Participants earn two units of graded credit, and each seminar is limited to an enrollment of 15 students.

The overall purpose of this freshman seminar is to introduce freshman students to the "pleasures and rigors" of academic life and to provide them the opportunity to work closely in a small group setting with a senior faculty member. Course goals also include the facilitation of active learning and critical thinking.

Overall, this freshman seminar is very representative of others of this genre. Another slight adaptation to this course type, however, is found at the University of California, Berkeley. Freshman/sophomore seminars (some restricted to freshmen only) are offered by each academic department. The course content is determined by faculty and is

generally interdisciplinary in focus. For instance, the freshman seminar offered by the Department of History for the 1991 fall semester was entitled "Mozart's World" and was described as a course that investigates the "social, political and historical world within which Mozart composed." Such a course would be a profound departure from the familiar freshman survey course about which it has been said, "If you miss a lecture, you miss a century." Even though these freshman seminars focus on specific academic content, they share with other seminar types the common goal of creating close interactions between students and faculty and between students themselves during the critical freshman year.

The Professional Seminar:

California Polytechnic State University - San Luis Obispo

California Polytechnic State University- San Luis Obispo offers a one quarter credit hour freshman orientation seminar in each of its professional schools. Some, but not all, of the courses are required by specific schools; all are graded credit/no credit. The seminars are taught in a variety of ways for different student groups. "At-risk" students are assigned to courses taught by Student Academic Services staff members. Other seminars taught by regular faculty within the respective disciplines are designed for students who do not require extra academic assistance. These courses focus heavily on basic terminology, essential study skills, and career preparation. Freshman seminars have been offered for ten years on this campus and are reported to enjoy a high level of overall campus support and prospects for future continuation.

As was discussed in the *Limitations* section of Chapter 3, the response rate for this category was disappointing and did not represent the numbers of such seminars known to exist in professional schools on

American campuses. However, the Cal Poly seminars are excellent examples of this course genre. As a group, they parallel other such seminars in terms of goals and topics, especially the primacy of a focus on terminology, skills, and demands of the major and future career.

Some professional schools, such at the College of Engineering at Michigan State University, offer a freshman seminar that is designed specifically for minority students. In addition to offering these students essential information and skills, such courses often purport to provide a mentor for each minority student. These mentors are either minority faculty members or practicing professionals within the community (G. Thompkins, personal communication, April 2, 1991).

Basic Study Skills Seminar: Community College of Micronesia.

Survey results indicated that Basic Study Skills Seminars were offered almost exclusively by institutions of low or medium selectivity. Such courses may be offered to all students or to selected groups defined as "high risk" or "academically underprepared." At the Community College of Micronesia, a two-year, open-admissions institution with a student population of under 1,000, all students are required to take a freshman seminar that focuses on such basic skills as using the dictionary and marking textbook passages for future reference. Students are also given instruction in lecture note-taking, library usage, organizing class notes, and time management. Faculty in the Languages and Literature Division teach the course which carries three semester hours of graded academic credit. Overall campus support for this course is "very high," and its prospects for continuation are "very good."

Basic study skills seminars are offered not only at community colleges but also at four-year institutions of low or moderate selectivity.

The Community College of Micronesia's basic study skills seminar is unusual in that it is required of all students. The majority of these courses are required only for students with academic deficiencies. This course is also unusual in that it carries academic credit. This credit, however, may or may not be transferrable to baccalaureate-level institutions.

"Other" Freshman Seminars

Of the 1,064 educators who responded to this survey, 17 chose the category "Other" to categorize the particular freshman seminar that is offered on their campus. These 17 seminars are, in some ways, similar to the seminar types previously described, but they also have significant differences that set them apart and make them unique ventures in freshman seminar programming. Following is a brief description of 16 of these 17 "nonconformist" freshman seminars. (One seminar was inadequately described on the survey instrument.)

1. The University of Notre Dame, a selective, four-year, private institution in Indiana offers a freshman seminar that is described as a "writing intensive." All students are required to take this course which is taught by faculty and graduate students. Faculty select the specific topics and associated readings that then become the subject for expository writing both in and out of class. The course is administered through the Freshman Writing Program, is taught in sections of no more than 18 students, and carries three semester hours of general education credit. The course goals listed are as follows: (a) "writing intensive," (b) "introduction to seminar method," and (c) "work with faculty in small groups."

2. The University of Maryland, Baltimore County, links a one-credit orientation seminar (a "Master Student" class) with a three-credit English composition course focusing on an analysis of professional and student writing. These classes are taught on separate days but are linked to become a single four-credit class. The English composition instructor attends all of the Master Student classes and reviews journals submitted for that class. The Master Student class is worth 25% of the total grade for the four-credit linked course. In English composition, the students write and revise a series of five take-home essays and also complete short writing activities both in and out of class. The overall goals for this course are "to help with the transition to college," "to make students aware of necessary skills and available resources," and "to promote interaction with a small group."

3. Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland requires all student athletes to take a freshman seminar titled "IMAGE"—I Manage A Great Experience. This course, which comprises 30 contact hours, focuses on specific college survival skills for student athletes. Although the course is required, it carries no academic credit. Goals of this course are the general provision of survival skills for students and the "preparation for transfer."

4. Denison University, a Carnegie Liberal Arts I institution in Granville, Ohio, has developed a Freshman Studies Program--seven courses designed as a comprehensive introduction to intellectual and artistic disciplines. Each freshman is required to take Freshman Studies 101 which is entitled "Words and Ideas." This course is designed to develop reading, writing, and library skills. Also, students must select one of the other six seminars which focus on a variety of subject areas.

Students are encouraged to live in residence halls with other students who are taking the same seminar courses. Overall program goals are the creation of a learning environment which "encourages active participation in the learning process," and the creation of a "common learning experience."

5. Erskine College in Due West, South Carolina, requires that all students take a freshman seminar course which is primarily an introduction to personal computing. Computer usage is combined with other topics such as study skills and career planning. Lecture material includes direct use of the various computers and software found on the Erskine campus. Each student must produce several computer documents and demonstrate a minimum level of computer knowledge by passing an oral exam. This course carries one semester hour of credit towards core requirements. The one course goal identified by the responder was "to help students become better students."

6. Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia, requires that all students complete a one-semester hour freshman seminar which focuses on the understanding of Judeo-Christian ethics and values within a Christian university setting. Assigned readings include Charles Coulson's *Against the Night*, the Bible, and *The Liberty Way*, an in-house text. Goals of this seminar are "to facilitate academic, spiritual, and social development" and "to facilitate interaction with faculty."

7. Marist College in Poughkeepsie, New York, requires students who have been given provisional admission to take a freshman seminar which is structured according to a "self-management model." This course was reportedly designed to help students define and reach goals, improve motivation, accept responsibility, and build a positive attitude.

This course carries one semester hour of elective credit. Regular and honors students may take the course but are not required to do so. The Marist College seminar has as its goals "helping students take responsibility for themselves" and "introducing them to an integrated self-management system."

8. Chipola Junior College in Marianna, Florida, a community college, offers a freshman seminar for honors students only. This seminar was designed to motivate superior students to a higher quality of scholarly endeavor and to give them a "superior peer group" for the remainder of their college experience. This seminar carries one semester hour of elective credit for enrolled students.

9. Rochester Institute of Technology in New York offers freshman seminars that are specific to individual academic departments which have chosen to participate in the Freshman Seminar Program. These discipline-specific courses are designed with a student affairs liaison, and many are co-taught by a faculty member and a student affairs professional. Course structure and requirements vary by department. Freshman seminars are described as being "50% department/major related activities and 50% 'know yourself' experiential work." Course goals are "to anchor students within their academic department" and "to foster the opportunity for self-discovery."

10. La Salle University in Philadelphia links a freshman orientation course with core courses in specific disciplines such as religion, English, and biology. This linked course, which is taught only by faculty, carries four hours of academic credit. Goals for this course are common to the goals of most orientation courses. They include easing the high school

to college transition and creating bonds between students, faculty, and institution.

11. Salem-Teikyo University in Salem, West Virginia, requires that all first-year students take a four semester hour seminar course entitled "Orientation to Multicultural Education." The objectives of this course, which is taught by faculty, are "to help students develop cultural sensitivity, thus enabling them to create and maintain positive relationships with people of diverse cultural backgrounds" and "to orient students to life on a multicultural campus."

12. Westmont College in Santa Barbara, California, offers a special course for "frosh" (This campus avoids the use of "freshman.") that meets weekly on campus but at least once a month in instructor's homes. This course is taught to small groups of no more than 10 students and focuses on providing students a Biblical basis for the life of the mind.

13. Loyola University in New Orleans requires that undecided first-time freshmen take special sections of freshman core courses. The professor serves as academic advisor for students in these courses. In addition to academic content, topics such as time management, using the library and campus facilities, career exploration, and benefits of a liberal arts education are introduced in both in- and out-of-class workshops. The goals of this course include improving retention of undecided students and "faculty development through a proactive approach to retention."

14. Austin College in Sherman, Texas, requires all first-year students to take a special course called "Communication/Inquiry." This is the first course of the required core. It is taught by selected faculty, assisted by one or more student leaders from all the disciplines. Faculty

instructors are called Mentors and are responsible not only for instruction, but also for assisting in the students' early orientation to campus and social life. Considering the ability level of entering students, mentors are responsible for developing courses of appropriate difficulty with regard to the topics and the intended depth of study. Students read from a variety of sources such as periodicals, fiction, drama, and poetry that are appropriate for a given topic. In addition they engage in at least one group problem-solving project and make at least one oral presentation each.

15. The University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh offers a weekly colloquium for students in an elective program entitled "The University Learning Community." Students and faculty (120 +) meet in a weekly common session to hear student presentations on intellectually challenging issues such as abortion and capital punishment.

16. Doane College in Crete, Nebraska, offers a freshman seminar which explores the relationship of learning in the classroom to learning gained by living in the community. The course focuses attention on academic and non-academic aspects of the community. It consists of public events programs and a limited community service project. Important session topics include the following: "The History of American Volunteerism," "Leadership and the Community Servant," and "Understanding Community Needs."

These 16 seminars offer an indication of the many ways in which freshman seminars can be utilized depending on the mission, character, and expectations of a particular campus. In spite of their differences, they, too, share the common goal of facilitating some aspect of the academic or social integration of students into the college environment.

Other Survey Findings

In addition to the foregoing quantitative and qualitative data, the surveys yielded a number of unintended findings with respect to the hidden corners of American higher education, how and to what end freshman programming is accomplished on the nation's campuses as well as current concerns and issues that both focus and affect freshman programming. Initially, these unsolicited comments were noted by the researcher because they helped bring to life what threatened to be a dull process of data entry. The comments were spotted and flagged for future reference, and ultimately they became an extra and unexpected bonus of information about the attitudes of the respondents themselves and their campuses with respect to freshmen and the freshman seminar.

Finding #1. One educator can, and often does, make a difference.

Whether for financial reasons or the altruism of a single faculty member, the freshman seminar is often created and maintained by one individual on a campus rather than a college, department, or task force. The freshman seminar was "largely one woman's work, who has now departed" from Wells College in Aurora, New York. At David Lipscomb University in Nashville, one instructor teaches all sections of the freshman seminar. At McPherson College, in McPherson, Kansas, the survey responder indicated that she was the "college, school, department, or unit responsible for freshman seminar content." The President of Piedmont Bible College in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, is the freshman seminar director. And finally, at Oklahoma Christian University of Science and Art in Oklahoma City, one professor teaches all sections of the freshman seminar and "has done so for over 25 years."

Finding #2. First-year students are not "peas in a pod."

One factor that accounts for the popularity of the freshman seminar is its adaptability as a course structure to meet the needs of various student sub-populations. Survey responses indicated that, while current freshman seminars are most frequently designed for heterogenous student groups, these courses can also be focused to the precise needs of student sub-populations such as freshman athletes, honors students, women, returning adults, commuters, and academically underprepared students.

Patrick Henry Community College in Martinsville, Virginia, has created a comprehensive program, which includes a freshman seminar, for its entering students who are single parents. The University of Southern California has implemented a special freshman seminar for students who are "suicidally inclined." The Lancaster campus of Ohio University offers a special freshman seminar for incarcerated students at a regional corrections facility, and Texas Tech University is piloting sections of the freshman seminar with selected fraternities and sororities.

Finding #3. Freshman seminars must prove themselves effective.

While assessment has become a universal fact of academic life, the process plays a special role with respect to the freshman seminar. Because many of these courses, in the language of organizational theory, are often "loosely coupled" in their relationship to the institution and the curriculum, they must prove themselves in order to survive. The criteria by which they are measured vary from campus to campus and inevitably relate to the type of seminar offered, the characteristics of participating students, and the overall mission and character of the institution.

Ramapo College in Mahwah, New Jersey, has what can only be described as an impressive system of freshman seminar evaluation. This college evaluates the following possible seminar outcomes: student opinions and satisfaction, persistence to sophomore year and graduation, student use of campus services and participation in campus activities, and out-of-class interaction with faculty. Results of these evaluations have shown statistically significant positive differences in all variables for freshman seminar students.

A letter accompanying the survey response from the University of Cincinnati tells a different story. Evaluation of the freshman seminar showed no differences in retention and academic performance for seminar students. Freshman seminar students did report a higher degree of social and academic integration, but because of "very serious budget problems" the freshman seminar program has been cut, and "resources have been reallocated to other interventions that appear more worthy."

The State University of New York at Buffalo reported a unique measure of the freshman seminar—whether freshman seminar instructors experienced an improvement in "faculty morale." Teaching the seminar reportedly did result in "increased faculty morale on this campus."

Designing an evaluation procedure for any complex intervention is never an easy or error-free process. The individual who responded to the survey on behalf of Eastern New Mexico State University argued, "I do not believe it is *ever* possible to attribute any of these outcomes to *one* variable [the freshman seminar]."

Finding #4. Some first-year students don't ask enough questions.

In responding to the survey item that asked, "What freshmen are required to take the freshman seminar?" the responder for Merced College in Merced, California, indicated that "no students are required to take the freshman seminar, but they think they are."

Finding #5. Campus budget problems are real and prevalent.

Although there may be no era in the history of American higher education in which educators perceived an embarrassment of riches, the current financial crisis being faced on many campuses is real and unlikely to go away in the near future. Periods of retrenchment force institutions to make hard choices between programs, and many activities either go begging or must depend on volunteers for their survival.

The Second National Survey revealed that institutions fund freshman seminar programs at levels that vary from zero to over $250,000. Northwest Nazarene College in Nampa, Idaho, offers a freshman year program for which there is no budget allocation. In the words of the responder, "Because of its importance, we are all 'pitching in' with hopes for the future!"

But the freshman seminar is only part of a much broader concern for many institutions. In responding to the survey question which asked institutions to judge the likelihood that their freshman seminar would be offered in five years, the responder from Roxbury Community College in Boston replied, "It's anyone's guess at this point what the fate of higher education in Massachusetts will be in five years."

Finding #6. "It's the real thing. . . or is it?"

What constitutes a "real" college course? This question is surely as old as the history of higher education. The very asking of this question

implies that some college courses are less than "real" as that word means "valid" for postsecondary education. Sincere educators differ over what should constitute higher learning and what kinds of information or assistance should be provided by colleges and universities or by some other source, such as the family, another institution, or private enterprise. And some sincere educators feel that a freshman seminar that is anything other than an academic course fails this test of "realness." This issue, among others, will be addressed in Chapter 6 but certainly will not be resolved in the foreseeable future by this or any other study. However, in answering survey questions about a particular freshman seminar at the University of California, Santa Cruz, the responder added the following exclamation: "It's a *real* course!"

Summary

Some of the most interesting findings generated by the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming cannot be analyzed by quantitative methods. Each freshman seminar type can be more thoroughly understood through case studies of representative seminars as they are enacted in particular institutions. In addition, many such courses are unique and were therefore categorized by responders as "Other" freshman seminars. Descriptions of these courses offer information about creative, one-of-a-kind adaptations of the freshman seminar structure.

The survey instruments themselves generated a number of unintended findings about freshman programming as well as current issues in American higher education that focus or affect such programming. These issues include the needs of specific student

sub-populations, the importance of assessment, and the overall lack of sufficient funding for higher education in America.

Chapter 6 will summarize the findings of the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming, draw conclusions from these findings, and offer recommendations for educational policy, practice, and future research.

CHAPTER 6

Summary and Discussion of Findings, Implications for Policy and Practice, and Recommendations for Future Research

Introduction

The past ten years in American higher education have witnessed a ground swell of interest in the freshman year. The proverbial underdogs of higher education have become an important commodity for the nation's colleges and universities. Many factors have converged to bring about a nationwide focus on the quality of the freshman year experience. These factors include

1. the dwindling pool of potential first-year students;
2. the many diverse characteristics and uneven academic preparation of those students;
3. the national freshman-to-sophomore dropout rate which hovers around 30% (American College Testing Program, 1991);
4. the financial crisis being faced by American higher education due, in part, to fewer potential students and higher attrition of those students;
5. a growing concern of educators about the quality of teaching of first-year students and lack of coherence in the first-year curriculum; and
6. a genuine concern on the part of many faculty, staff, and administrators for first-year students themselves.

A single curricular innovation that has proven itself effective in addressing the needs of first-year students, the deficiences in the curriculum, and last, but not least, that has been positively correlated with freshman retention is the freshman seminar. This course type has a history which pre-dates its use as a solution to the above problems. Since before the turn of the century, freshman seminars were employed both as courses which were primarily academic in content and as courses which were designed to give college students essential knowledge and skills for academic and social success. However, the most dramatic growth in numbers of freshman seminars on American campuses has occurred within the past ten years. As this study has shown, currently, about two-thirds of American colleges and universities offer a freshman seminar.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to investigate the nature and scope of the freshman seminar in American higher education. In 1988, the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience at the University of South Carolina undertook a similar national study to investigate one form of this course, the extended orientation or "college success" seminar. However, since that time, the Center had collected piecemeal evidence to suggest that at least four other discrete types of freshman seminars were being implemented on American college and university campuses. Although a great deal of information had been assembled and disseminated by the Center about the extended orientation freshman seminar, little was known about the nature or numbers of other freshman seminar types.

By means of a survey instrument (Appendix A) which was mailed to all regionally-accredited, two- and four-year colleges and universities with a student population of over 100 ($N = 2460$), data were collected to identify, compare, and contrast the various forms of freshman seminar programming in American higher education. These data have been reported in this study. This final chapter summarizes and discusses study findings, suggests implications for policy and practice at the national, state, and institutional level, and offers recommendations for future research.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

The data are summarized and discussed in the order in which they were originally presented to respond to the four primary research questions.

Research Question #I(A). Currently, what is the freshman seminar in American higher education? Can a concise definition of the freshman seminar be offered which is not only accurate but is also meaningful and useful for educators with little, if any, prior knowledge of this course type?

Through analysis of findings generated by this study, the freshman seminar was defined as a course which is designed to enhance the academic and/or social integration of first-year students through a variety of topics and processes. The complete definition of the freshman seminar which is provided on page 49, was, in the opinion of the researcher, accurate, but was not judged to be particularly meaningful or useful to educators who do not have prior knowledge of this course type. A concise definition of such a varied phenomenon as the freshman seminar is inherently unsatisfactory.

Research Question #1(B). How can the current variety of freshman seminars best be "typed" or categorized?

The hypothesized typology of freshman seminars developed by the researcher on the basis of empirical knowledge and existing piecemeal evidence was validated by survey responses. The most common freshman seminar types in American higher education are the following:

1. Extended orientation seminars
2. Academic seminars with common content across sections
3. Academic seminars with content that varies by section
4. Professional seminars
5. Basic study skills seminars

Because the response rate was low for the category "Professional seminars" (see *Limitations* in Chapter 3), that category was eliminated from further data analyses.

Survey responses indicated that the above types are not necessarily mutually exclusive. In fact, the striking similarity of overall goals and content of two of the hypothesized types—the extended orientation and basic study skills seminar—raised the question as to whether these are, in fact, discrete types of seminars. At least in terms of goals and related topics, the difference between these two types may be more a difference in primary focus than a difference in actual content. The factors identified in this study that differentiated extended orientation and basic study skills seminars were primarily structural. For instance, far more basic study skills seminars carry no academic credit in any amount, and far more are required for some, but not all, students on a particular campus. These students are almost always those who need remediation in order to survive the academic expectations of the freshman year. In

order to make a final determination about whether basic study skills seminars warrant separate categorization as a freshman seminar type, additional in-depth research should be done to compare and contrast specific seminars identified in each category.

Seventeen respondents indicated that their particular freshman seminar did not correspond to any listed type. These individuals selected the category "Other" to describe the seminar on their campus. In reviewing these seventeen seminars as a group (Chapter 5), they are in some ways similar to the more common five seminar categories. However, there is some unique aspect of each that became the basis for their identification as something other than one of the five listed seminar types.

Research Question #II(A). What percentage of American colleges and universities offer a freshman seminar of any type?

Of the 1064 responses to the survey instrument, 696 institutions (65.4%) indicated that they offer a freshman seminar (Appendix C). An additional 58 institutions (Appendix D) indicated that a seminar is planned for the 1992-93 academic year. Although the overall survey response rate was less than desired (43%), the responding institutions were found to be highly representative of all American colleges and universities in terms of size, selectivity, and Carnegie classification. Therefore, the reasonable assumption can be made that approximately two-thirds of all American colleges and universities offer a freshman seminar. This percentage has remained constant since the 1988 survey of freshman orientation seminar programming performed by the National Resource Center.

In light of other study findings indicating that almost 24% of these courses are products of the last two years, the stable percentage may indicate that some freshman seminars reported in 1988 have been eliminated. Follow-up research should be performed to identify not only the survivors with respect to freshman seminar programming, but also any possible casualties. Knowledge of the factors which contributed to the demise of some freshman seminars would be helpful to others who wish to see such courses survive and succeed.

Research Question #II(B). What are the characteristics of these seminars in general according to

goals,

content,

structure (maximum enrollments, grading, whether the seminar is required, amount and application of academic credit),

instructors (Who teaches the freshman seminar?),

instructional activities,

measured outcomes (What outcomes are formally measured?),

longevity,

administration,

academic advising (Is the freshman seminar instructor the academic advisor for his/her students?),

instructor training,

institutional support (from students, faculty, administration)?

Goals. With respect to the goals of freshman seminars in general, the clear emphasis, as indicated by survey responses, was on academic skills development. This general response category included such specific items as note-taking and reading as well as advanced writing and

research skills. Respondents cited goals that were both broad and specific, but all goals comprised some component of the underlying concept of academic and social integration.

Content. The most frequently reported content areas were also related to academic skills development. But many other topics were also mentioned including contemporary societal issues, the purpose of higher education, the development of values, and cultural diversity. The variety of goals and topics cited is an indication of the versatility of this course type and the variety of ways it is being used on American campuses.

Structure. For purposes of this study, the structure of the freshman seminar consists of (a) enrollments, (b) grading practices, (c) whether the course is required, (d) numbers and application of credit hours. Structurally, the majority of freshman seminars in general were found to be courses that enroll up to 25 students (68%), that are graded by a letter grade (68%), that are required for at least some students on campus (71%), and that carry one credit hour of elective credit (45%). These findings indicate that, with respect to the freshman seminar in general, institutions support its inclusion in the curriculum—up to a point. That point seems to be the number of credit hours that most colleges and universities allocate to freshman seminars. Although, it can certainly be argued that one hour per week is better than nothing, this time period is certain to limit the depth of coverage that can be given to any specific topic. In viewing this finding as an objective measure of campus support for the freshman seminar, one could perhaps conclude that such support has its limits, at least for some seminars.

Instructors. Although this study indicated that freshman seminars are undoubtedly taught by a more diverse group of instructors than any

other single course type, 84.5% of freshman seminars are taught by faculty. However, this study did not investigate faculty attitudes toward teaching the freshman seminar. Although respondents for some seminars reported increased faculty morale as a seminar outcome, such a desired outcome cannot be assumed. Further study of those particular seminars which report happier faculty as an outcome of teaching a freshman seminar should be undertaken to identify particular contributing factors.

Instructional activities. Essentially, this study indicated that freshman seminar instructors use a wide variety of reasonably traditional instructional activities in their classes. No activities were identified in the survey which have not been employed in other traditional courses. However, the primary reported focus within freshman seminars is upon those activities that are interactive and promote active learning. Group discussion was the most frequently reported instructional activity followed closely by the old standby, the lecture. But many survey respondents were almost apologetic in their mention of the lecture and added the comment that its use was infrequent and always supplemented by other more interactive classroom activities.

Measured outcomes. Cuseo (1991) has argued that the freshman seminar is the most assessed and evaluated course in American higher education. Survey responses indicated that over 50% of seminars are being evaluated. However, the most common forms of evaluation are those most traditional to academe—the end-of-semester course evaluation and periodic quizzes to test content mastery.

A factor that undoubtedly accounts for much of the recent popularity of the freshman seminar is its reported correlation with

increased levels of freshman-to-sophomore retention (Fidler, 1991). It is not surprising, therefore, that 43% of respondents indicated that the freshman seminar on their campus is routinely evaluated with respect to its impact on participant retention. Smaller percentages of respondents reported evaluation of other possible outcomes such as increased graduation rates, increased student use of campus services, and greater levels of student out-of-class interaction with faculty.

Based on the day-to-day experience of researchers in the National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience, the concern about assessing the freshman seminar is constant and pervasive. Many seminar directors have reported to Center personnel that they are required by their institutions to demonstrate the effectiveness of this course in terms of its clear impact on such outcomes as retention, improved grade point average, and improved student satisfaction with the institution.

Longevity. The findings on longevity of the freshman seminar were among the most intriguing of this study. Even though this course type has a one hundred year history in American higher education, over 80% of responding institutions with freshman seminars have implemented them within the past ten years. It seems apparent that it has taken a major convergence of crises with respect to students, curriculum, and institutional finances to propel this course into widespread use within the curriculum.

Since the current level of freshman seminar implementation seems to be in response to contemporary problems of higher education, there is no way to predict accurately the future prospects for this course type. It is highly unlikely that a course that has been offered within American

higher education for over 100 years will cease to exist. However, whether the current number of institutions with freshman seminars will increase, decrease, or remain stable over the next ten years is unknown. The history of higher education is replete with the "comings and goings" of curricular innovations (Grant & Riesman, 1978; Levine, 1980), and the quintessential guardians of the curriculum stand ready to oppose and undermine any course which fails their narrow test of curriculum authenticity. Although freshman seminars have many sincere supporters within faculty and administrative ranks, this course type also has many sincere opponents who consider it merely curriculum clutter.

Administration. Administratively, over 50% of freshman seminars are controlled by an academic unit and are directed by a faculty member. But just under 50% of such courses are also administered through divisions of student affairs and other campus support units. Gardner (1988) has long advocated a partnership approach to the ownership of this course between academic affairs and student affairs. A small number of survey respondents (4%) indicated that their freshman seminar was, in fact, administered by such a partnership. Although campus departments that compete for finite resources are often reluctant to become partners, the freshman seminar has occasionally become the means to that desired end.

Academic advising. Based on scattered reports, use of the freshman seminar as the site for academic advising has been increasing, and survey findings indicated that freshman seminar instructors do currently serve as academic advisors for some seminar students in just under 50% of seminars. Future surveys should provide needed

longitudinal data on this particular question, especially in regards to what kinds of institutions are most likely to combine the seminar with academic advising.

Instructor training. Freshman instruction has proverbially been categorized as a process by which "the unwilling teach the uninformed." To reduce that unfortunate possibility, 71% of institutions that offer freshman seminars also offer a period of "training" for freshman seminar instructors. Although it is impossible to generalize about the quality or specific characteristics of such training, based on the simple "yes/no" survey responses, it is often reportedly focused on the facilitation of group process, on understanding the characteristics of the current cohort of freshmen, on knowledge about current societal problems affecting students, and on exploring one's own values about the ethical dilemmas of contemporary life. Interestingly, almost 50% of institutions with freshman seminars make this training a prerequisite for prospective instructors. Anecdotal evidence has indicated that such training has provided for some faculty, their first "teacher training" workshop and perhaps also their first opportunity to meet other faculty and staff across the campus for the express purpose of thinking and talking about teaching.

Institutional support. Finally, survey respondents reported that the majority (65%) of freshman seminars are enjoying high levels of campus support. Without far more information about objective indicators of support, it is impossible to make a judgment about the validity of this finding. Although the survey instrument included questions which were designed to provide objective information about campus support of the freshman seminar, these questions did not yield the kind of information

from which any particular level of campus support could be inferred. In order to investigate how well a course such as the freshman seminar is supported on a particular campus, a qualitative research approach is advisable. Only through a thorough understanding of the intricacies of campus mission, ethos, expectations, and standard operating procedures, can such a judgment be made.

Research Question #III(A). What is the distribution of current freshman seminars according to seminar type?

Responses to the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming indicated that the vast majority (71%) of the 696 institutions that reported freshman seminars offer extended orientation seminars. The next most common seminar type is the academic seminar with common content across all sections (12.1% of institutions). Academic seminars with content that varies by section comprised seven percent of those freshman seminars identified by this survey; basic study skills seminars comprised six percent.

As has been discussed in *Limitations* in Chapter 3, responses in the professional seminar category (n = 10) were not representative of the numbers of such seminars known to exist on American campuses. Therefore, no separate data analyses were performed for professional seminars. The remaining 2.4% of freshman seminars reported were categorized as "other."

Although virtually all respondents were able to chose a listed seminar type as being "most like" the seminar on their campus, 44% of respondents indicated that their freshman seminar was a hybrid, a combination of two or more listed types. Again, follow-up qualitative research is needed in order to validate the reporting of seminar types and

to determine how institutions go about creating an effective hybrid seminar.

Research Question #IIIB. Is there a relationship between freshman seminar type and the following institutional characteristics:

1. selectivity as measured by mean entering SAT or ACT scores and students' high school records,

2. Carnegie classification (1987),

3. size of institution's undergraduate population,

4. ethnic diversity of institution's undergraduate population?

Although there were significant differences for all independent variables with respect to type of freshman seminar, the findings indicated that type of freshman seminar is more a function of institutional selectivity than any of the other three variables. Highly selective institutions are more likely to offer academic freshman seminars with either common or various content across sections and less likely to offer a basic study skills seminar than institutions of either moderate or low selectivity. With respect to the Carnegie classification system, Liberal Arts I and Research Universities, many of which are highly selective, are more likely to offer academic freshman seminars than are other types of institutions. Finally, institutions with a student population of between 1001 and 5000 and institutions that have a moderately diverse student population are the most common sites for academic freshman seminars.

Research Question #IV. How do freshman seminars differ by type according to the variables listed in Research Question #IIB (Items 1 - 11)?

Goals. Freshman seminar goals reported on the survey instrument were remarkably consistent across the four seminar types (extended orientation seminars, academic seminars with common content across

sections, academic seminars with content that varies by section, and basic study skills seminars). The most commonly reported goal for all seminars was academic skills development. This finding again substantiates the assertion that all freshman seminars, irrespective of type, are intended to enhance the academic and/or social integration of students. Specific elements of content may vary according to seminar type, but many of the overall goals appear to be the same.

Content. The survey question which generated these findings asked for responses only from institutions in which the freshman seminar has common content across sections. Therefore, the 49 reported freshman seminars with academic content that varied by section were not included in data analyses for this question.

Data analyses identified a striking similarity of topics reported for basic study skills and extended orientation seminars. These findings raise the question as to whether these two seminar types are, in fact, different from each other. Other survey findings indicated a number of structural differences between these two seminars; however, at least in terms of content, they are virtually identical (see page 79 for further discussion). Survey findings indicated that academic seminars do address more traditional academic topics, especially in regard to the purpose of the liberal arts and general education, than either the extended orientation or basic study skills seminar.

Structure. In terms of class size, academic seminars were found to be more likely to correspond to the traditional seminar size of 15 or fewer students. All freshman seminars, irrespective of type, are more likely to be graded by a letter grade and to carry academic credit. The one-credit

hour course is most common for extended orientation and basic study skills seminars; the three-credit hour (or more) course is most common for academic seminars. Fifty-two percent of extended orientation and 75% of basic study skills seminars carry elective credit; almost 70% of academic seminars carry either core or general education credit. Freshman seminars with consistent academic content are more likely to be required for all students, and basic study skills seminars for some students. Academic seminars with content that varies by section are more likely to be elective for all students than any other seminar type.

The reported differences in amount and application of credit awarded the various types of freshman seminars may be one objective indication of how seminar types differ in terms of institutional support. If the assumption can be made that a greater number of credit hours applied to either core, major, or general education credit equals greater campus support, then this finding seems to indicate that academic seminars enjoy stronger overall levels of campus support than basic study skills or extended orientation seminars.

Instructors. Faculty members teach or co-teach the vast majority (84%) of freshman seminars, irrespective of type. Student affairs professionals, other campus administrators, undergraduate and graduate students are more likely to teach orientation seminars than other seminar types. Again, no conclusions can be drawn from this finding about instructor attitudes toward teaching a freshman seminar.

Instructional activities. Little variance was seen between seminar types in the kinds of instructional activities reported. Lecture was the most frequently reported activity for extended orientation and basic study skills seminars; class discussion, the most frequently reported

activity for academic seminars. However, the frequency differences between lecture and class discussion were quite small for all seminar types (see Table 29 on page 87). Follow-up case study research would be helpful in describing the precise balance of activities used in various freshman seminar types and in determining whether real differences exist with respect to classroom activities.

Evaluation. The outcome most commonly measured for all freshman seminars is the outcome most commonly measured for traditional college courses—student opinion of/satisfaction with course instructor. Freshman-to-sophomore retention, a reported outcome of many extended orientation seminars (Fidler, 1991), is now measured for almost 50% of extended orientation seminars. But in addition, in spite of the absence of substantiating research, this outcome is also measured for approximately one-third of all other seminar types. As the doors of institutions of all selectivity levels open to admit at least some students of diverse ethnic backgrounds and uneven academic preparation, retention is apparently becoming a more common concern.

Even the most esoteric freshman seminars as well as those designed only for honors students reported as goals some of the factors known to enhance retention by contributing to academic and social integration of students (Tinto, 1987). These factors include establishing close interactions between the faculty member and students, providing a common educational experience for students, and increasing the overall likelihood of college success.

Longevity. Freshman seminars of all types are the "new kids on the curriculum block." Approximately 80% of the survey respondents reported that the freshman seminar, irrespective of type, was begun

during the last ten years. This finding indicates that the freshman seminar is being used to address a variety of current educational problems depending on how those problems are defined and prioritized by various institutions. This course can address personal and academic problems of students and well as perceived deficiencies in the curriculum. The freshman seminar can also be a mechanism for creating stronger and more personal faculty-student relationships and for bonding students more intentionally to the institution.

There is no crystal ball for higher education that would provide an answer to the question, "Is the freshman seminar a 'blip' or a trend?" Future studies of this course type are needed to provide essential information about the prospects for long-term survival of the freshman seminar in American higher education and what factors enhance or reduce those long-term prospects.

Administration. Freshman seminars of all types are most commonly administered through an academic unit and directed by a faculty member. However, a substantial number of extended orientation seminars are administered either through a division of student affairs or a joint task force or committee that brings together academic and student affairs.

Survey findings indicated that there is great diversity of existing campus administrative structures. This became apparent with respect to the large number of unique campus offices that were reported on the survey instrument to have administrative responsibility for the freshman seminar. In fact, the category, "other," was the most frequent response with respect to the administration of academic seminars with various content.

Academic Advising. Study findings indicated that combining freshman seminar instruction with academic advising is perhaps an idea whose time has come, at least for some institutions. In extended orientation as well as academic seminars, approximately 50% of freshman seminar instructors currently serve as the academic advisor for either some or all seminar students. Instructors of basic study skills seminars are less likely to serve as seminar students' academic advisors.

The freshman seminar instructor has the opportunity to interact with students in a highly personal and objective way with regard to the students' future academic and career plans. Such objectivity of advising is often lost when first-year students are forced or strongly encouraged to declare a major within the first semester. First-year students then become the property of an academic department, and the department is often reluctant to let go of any available student.

On some campuses the combining of academic advising into the freshman seminar apparently works well. But on other campuses, such a system would be difficult to implement without significant opposition from competing academic departments. Additional research is needed to identify the advantages and disadvantages of linking freshman seminar instruction with academic advising in particular types of institutions.

Instructor training. Survey results indicated that freshman seminar instruction is not perceived by many institutions as a duty which should be taken lightly. In fact, two-thirds of institutions offering freshman seminars of all types offer some form of training for seminar instructors. Training is most likely to be offered for instructors who teach academic seminars with common content, and least likely to be offered for instructors who teach academic seminars of various content. The latter

category of instructors is generally comprised of faculty members who are teaching a freshman seminar that focuses on their particular area of expertise or interest. Such instructors are likely to be resistant to training, although it cannot be assumed that they are less in need of it. Training is most frequently required as a prerequisite for freshman seminar instruction with respect to academic seminars with common content (66%) and extended orientation seminars (49%).

Institutional support. Survey findings indicated that, in the opinions of the respondents, all freshman seminars, irrespective of type, enjoy high levels of campus support. However, support levels are reportedly highest for academic seminars and lowest for basic study skills seminars. These findings indicate that institutions are less likely to give wholehearted support to those activities which they consider remedial, although such activities may be essential to student survival and success.

Summation. The analyses of responses to the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming have identified both similarities and differences between the known types of freshman seminar courses and how these seminars are employed by institutions of varying size, type, degree of selectivity, and ethnic diversity. The variety of ways in which institutions have used the freshman seminar structure to address the common goal of enhancing first-year students' academic and social integration validates a traditional concept of organizational theory, the concept of equifinality (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Equifinality is an organizational term which, in common language, means that there is more than one effective way to skin the proverbial cat. Colleges and universities may design a freshman seminar which provides students

essential information for negotiating the campus, for academic success, and for dealing with the challenge of personal autonomy. Other campuses may design a course which introduces first-year students to a common academic theme from a variety of disciplinary perspectives or to an esoteric topic which is the driving academic or personal interest of a single faculty member. Through either approach or through a variety of other specific approaches, students who work together in a highly interactive and supportive small group atmosphere can experience a greater sense of belonging, of bonding, of mutual support, and of overall satisfaction with the campus and with the process of higher education.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Findings from the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming have provided a number of models of outstanding freshman programs on the nation's campuses. The challenges addressed by these programs as well as their intended and unintended successes offer implications for broad educational policy to improve the freshman year and the entire undergraduate experience. Following is a review of policy implications based on study findings.

1. Results of the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming indicate that increasing numbers of colleges and universities are concerned about the academic and social success of first-year students. But the factors which help or hinder entering college students often have their roots in the primary and secondary educational system. On a national, state, and local level, colleges and universities should work more closely with the K-12 system to develop effective ways of easing the academic and social transition of students from high school to college. The increasing numbers of school/college

partnerships in the United States is at least one indication that such efforts are underway (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991). The disparity between the culture of the American high school and the American college is profound and is, in itself, a possible barrier to college student success. The effort to improve the retention of first-year students must therefore begin long before the first year of college. Educators at all levels should work together to develop strategies to assure that more students have the opportunity to go to college and the requisite skills to survive the experience.

2. Spring (1989) presented a powerful argument that the federal government controls the direction of education at all levels by selectively funding educational efforts which will serve government and corporate interests. He maintained that such policies "enslave" generations of students, especially those who are dependent on federal scholarships and loans.

According to R. Landis (personal communication, 1/31/92), the federal government is now indirectly supporting the creation of some freshman seminars through federal grant support of programs designed to recruit and retain first-year minority students in science and math. A number of such programs, which have been funded through the National Science Foundation, have as their primary retention strategy the creation of a freshman seminar-type course which combines discipline-specific study skills with the intentional development of close relationships between students and faculty. With National Science Foundation support, Landis and his colleagues at California State University, Los Angeles, are currently working on the design of a generic freshman seminar for all first-year students in schools of engineering. Both

government and business leaders believe that this selective funding is essential to assure the necessary pool of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers for the twenty-first century.

However, to assure that minority students have the freedom to select their preferred area of academic and career interest, funding should also be made available to institutions that wish to design similar programs to recruit and retain minority students in liberal arts disciplines. Such comprehensive programs would likely include a focused freshman seminar.

3. The academic fate of freshmen is often dependent upon the quality of teaching they receive. At best, this quality is uneven in American colleges and universities. Both on survey instruments and in follow-up personal communications, freshman seminar administrators reported that instructor training workshops offered for freshman seminar instructors often become an institution's first, and perhaps only, systematic focus on freshman and undergraduate instruction. Such workshops often provide a forum for a campuswide dialogue on teaching and frequently raise faculty consciouness about the unique needs and characteristics of their first-year students.

Training in effective instruction of first-year students should not be provided just to those who teach freshman seminars. Rather, institutions should design periodic teaching workshops or symposia for all faculty that include a focus on the particular needs of first-year students and strategies for teaching them effectively. When graduate teaching assistants are used to staff freshman classes, these graduate students should receive appropriate pedagogical training for their primary role as instructors of first-year students. This training should

include some attention to the importance of group process as well as the importance of faculty/student interaction in freshman courses. The finest freshman seminar or the most elaborate system of co-curricular programming cannot compensate for inadequate instruction in a student's traditional first-year courses.

4. Upcraft and Gardner (1989) maintain that the most effective freshman seminars are designed to facilitate freshman success in all aspects of college life--academic, social, and personal. The majority of freshman seminars identified on the Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming have multiple goals that support a holistic definition of freshman success. With or without a freshman seminar, institutions should define freshman success broadly and should implement programs intentionally designed to facilitate that success (Upcraft & Gardner). As the Committee on the Student in Higher Education (1968) argued, "Cognitive growth which is separated from the development of other aspects of the human personality is illusory or distorted" (p. 8). Intellectual development cannot be separated from the development of the whole personality, and efforts to do so are doomed to failure (Committee on the Student in Higher Education, p. 9).

5. At both the state and institutional level, systematic assessments of the quality of freshman life should be part of the total assessment procedure. First-year students are often compliant and reluctant to complain about even the most egregious injustices. Institutions must take the initiative in determining the existing quality of life for first-year students both in and out of the classroom and should report their

findings and response to those findings to prospective students, to each other, and to state coordinating boards.

6. The degree to which first-year students experience academic and social integration into campus life is often a function of basic fit between the student and institution (Tinto, 1975). Colleges and universities should assure that those individuals who market the institution to prospective students do so with honesty and integrity, keeping the students needs, not the needs of the institution, in primary focus. Although many freshman seminars are designed, in part, to bond students to an institution, these seminars cannot nor should they be expected to create a good fit between students and the institution if one does not exist. However, freshman seminars can assist students in feeling a sense of belonging to the college or university and in discovering aspects of campus life in which they can become intensely involved.

7. In designing the content, the structure, and the system for administrative delivery of a freshman seminar, institutions should pay close attention to the existing campus value system, power structure, and needs of entering students. As the many models of excellent and long-standing freshman seminars identified in this study have demonstrated, there is no one best freshman seminar for every institution. But based on survey findings as well as other piecemeal evidence collected by the National Resource Center, colleges and universities are well advised to create a seminar that is congruent with institutional mission and ethos, to involve both faculty and staff in its planning and administration, and to provide real rewards to those who teach and direct these courses in terms of compensation and credit for tenure and promotion.

Recommendations for Future Research

In some ways, this study has raised as many questions about the freshman seminar as it has answered. Therefore, there are many possible directions for further research on this course type. Some of these possible directions are the following:

1. Future periodic national surveys of freshman seminar programming should be undertaken to develop a longitudinal picture of this course and its ongoing use in American higher education.

2. In-depth case study research of both successful and unsuccessful freshman seminars should be undertaken. Such research will provide essential information to campuses that are in the initial planning stages of such courses. Colleges and universities are well-advised to learn from the triumphs and failures of others in order to plan for long-term survival of the freshman seminar.

3. Follow-up research should be undertaken to determine whether the freshman seminar types hypothesized by this study are, in fact, valid. Survey responses reported herein raised particular questions about the differences and similarities between extended orientation and basic study skills seminars, but no ultimate conclusion was reached with respect to the need for their identification as discrete seminar types. Case study research of specific seminars in each category would provide needed clarification.

4. Case study research should focus on the various hybrid freshman seminars, those courses which attempt to accomplish a wide range of specific objectives related both to specific academic content and student needs. Such research should be directed toward answering questions about the exact nature of such courses, toward defining a workable

balance of content and process elements, and toward determining how such courses should be structured in terms of class size, class activities, and course length in order to meet their multiple objectives.

5. Results of this survey raised significant questions related to the degree of overall campus support for freshman seminars. Future research should attempt to identify objective measures of support such as credit hours, budgets, student participation, and faculty attitudes and then relate those measures of support to the various existing types of freshman seminars. Additional research should then identify the internal factors related to strong or weak support of particular seminars of each discrete type. Special attention should be paid to those factors that can be altered or controlled by the institution such as (a) whether the seminar enjoys unequivocal support from the top levels of campus administration, (b) how and by whom the seminar was originally developed, (c) how the course has evolved over time, and (c) whether a broad base of faculty and staff involvement and support was intentionally created and is intentionally maintained for the freshman seminar.

6. Additional research is needed relative to the desired and actual outcomes of freshman seminar courses. Research design of such studies can pose a significant challenge to skilled and unskilled researchers. But if this "loosely-coupled" course is to persist, the accomplishment of its institution-specific goals must be validated.

7. An interesting research avenue which should be explored is the correlation between the attitude of freshman seminar instructors toward teaching the seminar, before, during, and after seminar instruction and the outcomes of the course. All instructors are not equal, and colleges

and universities would benefit from knowledge about what impact faculty attitudes have on seminar outcomes.

8. A related topic which should be researched is the impact that freshman seminar instruction has on the instructors themselves—(a) whether such teaching, in fact, does increase faculty morale as was reported by one responding institution, (b) whether teaching the freshman seminar has an impact, either positive or negative, on the achievement of tenure, promotion, or salary increases, (c) whether teaching the freshman seminar improves teaching skills overall or teaching evaluations in other courses, (d) whether faculty use the seminar as a pedagogical laboratory to test instructional methods. The impact of freshman seminar instruction on the instructors themselves would likely be related to other factors such as whether these instructors are specifically trained for freshman seminar instruction, their existing attitudes about such courses, their skill in adopting interactive modes of instruction, and perhaps even their own memories of freshman life.

9. Case studies of freshman seminars which were identified as being the result of "one person's efforts" should be undertaken to provide interesting information about the process of change in American higher education, the personal characteristics and public actions of the change agent, and what happens to that change when its chief proponent is no longer in the picture.

10. If freshman seminars are intended to meet student needs, then research should be performed to ask the students themselves whether this goal was accomplished from their perspective. Such findings could be used to structure subsequent seminar programs that would be relevant to the particular attitudes and concerns of students.

11. Because the freshman seminar is being utilized as the site for academic advising in some institutions, case study research should be undertaken to determine whether or how the linkage of advising and freshman seminar instruction can be accomplished effectively.

Epilogue: "Will you love me tomorrow?"

No one can accurately predict whether or to what degree the current popularity of the freshman seminar will continue or how this course will evolve over time. The actual longevity (over 100 years) of the freshman seminar would seem to indicate that it will continue to be a part of the curriculum for the foreseeable future. In the opinion of the researcher, the freshman seminar has earned the position as a "real" course, as real is defined to mean "valid," "essential," and "useful" for students, and its acceptance as a real course should bode well for its future prospects. But to paraphrase a metaphor coined by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1980), the freshman seminar will likely have multiple futures depending on the specific characteristics and needs of institutions and their students.

It is the sincere hope of this researcher that first-year students will continue to be the beneficiaries of intentional programming to ease their transition into college. This programming should include, but not be limited to, the implementation of freshman seminars that are at least one semester in length.

Whatever the final fate of the freshman seminar on a particular campus, the successful implementation of this course has provided

many lessons which can inform in-class and out-of-class instruction at the college level. These lessons include the following:

1. First-year students benefit from participating in a small, informal, discussion-oriented class not to exceed 25 students. Such classes allow them to interact with each other and the academic material in a way that may provide a needed contrast to their experience in high school and their experiences in many other freshman courses.

2. Irrespective of course content, instructors can help students bond to the institution by attending to the development of personal relationships among students and between individual students and the instructor.

3. The attention to relationships between all members of a small class pays clear dividends in terms of increased levels of student retention and satisfaction with the college experience.

4. All first-year students, no matter what their entering ability level, can benefit from a focus on academic skills development. Certain academic processes are unique to higher education and will not have been experienced before by entering students, no matter what their innate abilities may happen to be. In addition, many students need basic academic skills development in order to have any chance at all to succeed in college. If colleges and universities are serious about wanting to increase the access of more students to higher education, they must act on those beliefs by providing students the skills they need to succeed. Pointing the finger at the K-12 system is, in and of itself, a waste of time.

5. Teaching first-year students can be a rewarding experience for many faculty members. The traditional attitude within higher education which has equated faculty status with distance from first-year students

is being challenged by the numbers of senior faculty and administrators who choose to teach freshman seminars from year to year.

6. The curriculum does not have to sacrifice academic integrity to become more student-centered. The successful implementation of courses that provide a combination of challenging academic content and attention to the needs of individual students is a clear indication that these need not be disparate goals.

As these six lessons attest, the freshman seminar has made significant contributions to students, to the curriculum, to faculty, and to higher education as a whole. It has earned a permanent place as a flexible course within the higher education curriculum and will most likely continue to evolve in a variety of ways to meet the needs of succeeding generations of first-year students.

APPENDIX A

The Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming (Survey Instrument)

NUMBER

PUBLIC/PRIVATE

2-YEAR/4-YEAR

SELECTIVITY

CARNEGIE CLASS

Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming

National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience
University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208

1. Name of Institution _____

2. City_____ 3. State_____ 4. Zip Code_____

Your Name _____ Title_____
Telephone number _____

5. What is the current undergraduate population of your institution?
a) ___ under 1,000; b) ___ 1,000-5,000; c) ___ 5,001-10,000;
d) ___ 10,001-20,000; e) ___ over 20,000.

6. What is the current number of freshmen at your institution? a)___under 250;
b)___ 250-1,250; c) ___1,251-2,500; d) ___2,501- 5,000; e)___over 5,000.

7. What is the ethnic make-up of your campus?
a) ___Over 90% of undergraduates are of one ethnic group (e. g., white, black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander).
b) ___From 75 to 90% of undergraduates are of one ethnic group.
c) ___No one ethnic group comprises more than 75% of the undergraduate population.

8. Does your institution (including any department or division) offer one or more freshman seminar-type courses? _____yes, _____no

If **yes,** please attach a current sample syllabus or course description with returned survey.

9. If **no,** do you plan to offer such a course in the next academic year (1992-93)? __yes __no

IF YOUR INSTITUTION DOES NOT CURRENTLY OFFER A FRESHMAN SEMINAR-TYPE COURSE, PLEASE DISREGARD REMAINING QUESTIONS, AND RETURN SURVEY IN THE ATTACHED ENVELOPE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSE.

* * * * * * *

IF YOUR INSTITUTION CURRENTLY OFFERS A FRESHMAN SEMINAR-TYPE COURSE, PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINING SURVEY QUESTIONS.

10. Check each discrete type of freshman seminar (a,b, c, d, e, or f) that exists on your campus.

a)___**Extended orientation seminar.** Sometimes called freshman orientation, college survival, or student success course. May be taught by faculty, administrators, and/or student affairs professionals. Content will likely include introduction to campus resources, time management, study skills, career planning, cultural-diversity, student development issues.

b)___**Academic seminar with generally uniform academic content across sections.** May either be an elective or a required course, sometimes interdisciplinary or theme oriented, sometimes part of a required general education core. Will often include academic skills components such as critical thinking and expository writing.

c)___**Academic seminars on various topics.** Specific topics are chosen by faculty who teach sections. Will generally be elective courses. Topics may evolve from any discipline or may include societal issues such as biological and chemical warfare, urban culture, animal research, tropical rain forests, the AIDS epidemic.

d)___**Professional seminar.** Generally taught within professional schools or specific disciplines such as engineering, health sciences, or education to prepare students for the demands of the major and the profession.

e)___**Study skills seminar.** Generally offered for academically underprepared students. Will focus on such basic skills such as grammar, note-taking, and time management.

f)___**Other** (Please describe in detail)_____
_____
_____
_____

Please note:

IF YOU HAVE CHECKED MORE THAN ONE FRESHMAN SEMINAR TYPE, SELECT THE SEMINAR (a, b, c, d, e, or f) WITH THE HIGHEST TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND ANSWER SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR THAT SEMINAR ONLY. A MEMBER OF OUR SURVEY TEAM WILL CONTACT YOU FOR INFORMATION REGARDING THE OTHER SEMINARS ON YOUR CAMPUS.

11. I am answering remaining questions for seminar a__, b__, c__, d__, e__, f__

12. In your opinion, what are three primary goals of your freshman seminar program?

_____
_____
_____

13. If your seminar has a common curriculum across sections, what, in your opinion, are the most important topics that comprise the content of the freshman seminar? (List up to 5 topics.)

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____

14. Please identify titles and authors of up to 3 books used as texts in the freshman seminar.

_____, _____
_____, _____
_____, _____

15. List up to 5 primary instructional (pedagogical) activities employed in the freshman seminar (for example: lecture, group discussion).

_____, _____
_____, _____
_____

16. What is the maximum number of students allowed to enroll in each freshman seminar section? _____

17. How many sections of the freshman seminar are being offered on your campus in Fall,1991?_____

18. Who teaches the freshman seminar? (Check all that apply.)

a. _____ Faculty
b. _____ Student affairs professionals
c. _____ Other campus administrators
d. _____ Upper-level undergraduate students
e. _____ Graduate students
f. _____ Other (please identify)_____

19. Does the freshman seminar instructor serve as the academic advisor for his/her students? ___yes (all sections), ___yes (some sections), ___ no

20. How is the freshman seminar graded? ____pass/fail, ____letter grade

21. What college, school, department, or unit is responsible for establishing content for the freshman seminar? _____

22. Is there a director of the freshman seminar program? __yes, __no

23. If yes, what is that person's faculty rank and/or administrative position? _____
_____

24. Which, if any, freshman seminar outcomes are formally evaluated? Check all that apply.
Please respond to questions #24 and #25 only if you <u>track</u> outcomes on any of the following variables.

a) _____ content knowledge
b) _____ student opinions of or satisfaction with course/instructor
c) _____ persistence to sophomore year
d) _____ persistence to graduation
e) _____ student use of campus services
f) _____ student participation in campus activities
g) _____ out-of-class interaction with faculty
h) _____ friendships among freshman seminar classmates
i) _____ other (please describe)_____

25. Based on formal evaluation, which, if any, of the following outcomes are the result of the freshman seminar? Check all that apply.

a) _____ increased content knowledge
b) _____ student satisfaction with course/instructor
c) _____ increased persistence to sophomore year
d) _____ increased persistence to graduation
e) _____ increased use of campus services
f) _____ increased level of student participation in campus activities
g) _____ increased out-of-class interaction with faculty
h) _____ increased number of friendships among freshman seminar classmates
i) _____ other (please describe) _____

26. Administratively, how is the freshman seminar configured for workload and compensation? (Check all that apply.)

a) _____ as part of a faculty member's regular teaching load
b) _____ as an overload course for faculty
c) _____ as one of the assigned responsibilities for administrator/staff instructors
d) _____ as an extra responsibility for administrator/staff seminar instructors
e) _____ other

27. If taught as an overload or extra responsibility, is financial or other compensation offered for teaching a freshman seminar? _____yes, _____no

28. Is instructor training offered for freshman seminar instructors? ___ yes, ___no

29. Is instructor training required for freshman seminar instructors? ___yes, ___no

30. How long has the freshman seminar been offered on your campus? _____ years

31. What freshmen are required to take the freshman seminar? ___all, ___some, ___none.

32. If you answered "some" to the previous question, which freshmen (by category) are required to take the freshman seminar? _____

33. Are different sections of the freshman seminar offered for any of the following unique sub-populations of students? Check all that apply.

a) __ Adults
b) __ Minority students
c) __ Commuting students
d) __ Athletes
e) __ Handicapped students
f) __ International students
g) __ Students residing within a particular residence hall
h) __ Women
i) __ High-risk students
j) __ Students within a specific major
k) __ Honors students
l) __ Undecided students
m) __ Incarcerated students
n) __ Other. Please identify _____

34. Approximately what percentage of freshmen take the freshman seminar as an elective?
a) __less than 25%, b) __25 to 50%, c) __50 to 75%, d) __ 75 to 100%.

35. How many total classroom contact hours (clock hours) comprise the entire freshman seminar course? __

36. Does the freshman seminar carry academic credit towards graduation? __yes, __no

37. If yes, how many credits does the freshman seminar carry toward graduation?

a)___ 1 semester hour
b)___ 2 semester hours
c)___ 3 semester hours
d)___ more than 3 semester hours
e)___ quarter hours (indicate number)
f) ___ other credits (please describe)

38. If the freshman seminar carries academic credit, how does such credit apply?

a)___ toward core requirements
b)___ toward general education requirements
c)___ as an elective
d) ___toward major requirements
e) ___other (please describe)

39. What is the total annual operating budget for the freshman seminar program? _____

40. On a scale from 1 to 5 (1 being highly unlikely, 5 being highly likely) what do you perceive to be the likelihood that the freshman seminar will be offered on your campus in 5 years?
(highly unlikely)___1___2___3___4___5 (highly likely)

41. On a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high), what do you believe to be the level of overall campus support (from students, faculty, staff, administration) for the freshman seminar?
(low)___1___ 2___ 3___4___5(high)

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter for Second National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29208

UNIVERSITY 101

Conferences on The Freshman Year Experience
International Conference on The First Year Experience
National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience
(803) 777-6029/3799

September 6, 1991

Dear Colleague:

I am writing you in my capacity as Director of the University of South Carolina's National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience to ask your assistance in helping our research staff enlarge and update our existing database on the freshman seminar course, an increasingly widespread curricular form in freshman education. Enclosed you will find a brief survey instrument which we would ask that you, or someone whom you designate, complete and return to us by October 31, 1991. We would suggest that, if possible, the instrument be completed by a person who is directly involved in freshman programming. We strongly believe that your contribution to our database will enable us to provide a sound research basis for one of the most flexible and useful reform initiatives in the freshman curriculum--i.e., the freshman seminar.

The National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience serves as a repository of information about programs, both curricular and co-curricular, that enhance the success and retention of first-year students. We are called upon by many institutions of all types to provide assistance in developing freshman seminar courses with a variety of campus-specific formats, topics, and intended outcomes. By enlarging and refining our own database, we will be better able to provide such assistance to colleges and universities. We would also hope that this project will be of use to you in your own institution.

Findings of this national survey will be published in the Summer of 1992 and will be made available to institutions upon request. If you need assistance in completing the survey, please write or call Betsy Barefoot, Associate Director, National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience, 1728 College Street, Columbia, SC 29208, (803) 777-6029. If you would like to discuss any other aspect of our work on behalf of first-year students--i.e., our Freshman Year Experience conferences, our Resource Center publications, etc.--I would very much like to hear from you directly myself.

For your convenience in returning the survey, we have enclosed a self-addressed envelope. Thank you most sincerely for your attention and timely response. Best wishes for a successful academic year.

Sincerely,

John Gardner
Director

vh
Enclosure

APPENDIX C

American Colleges and Universities Reporting

Freshman Seminars - Fall, 1991

Abraham Baldwin College	Tifton	GA
Adams State College	Alamosa	CO
Aguadilla Reg.Coll,Univ of PR	Ramey Base	PR
Aims CC	Greeley	CO
Alabama A&M University	Normal	AL
Albertus Magnus College	New Haven	CT
Albion College	Albion	MI
Allan Hancock College	Santa Maria	CA
Allegany CC	Cumberland	MD
Allegheny College	Meadville	PA
Allen County CC	Iola	KS
Alma College	Alma	MI
Ana G. Mendez Univ System	Rio Piedras	PR
Anderson College	Anderson	SC
Andover College	Portland	ME
Andrews University	Berrien Springs	MI
Angelina College	Lufkin	TX
Antelope Valley College	Lancaster	CA
Aquinas College	Newton	MA
Arkansas College	Batesville	AR
Asheville-Buncombe Tech CC	Asheville	NC

Ashland University	Ashland	OH
Augsburg College	Minneapolis	MN
Augustana College	Rock Island	IL
Augustana College	Sioux Falls	SD
Aurora University	Aurora	IL
Austin College	Sherman	TX
Austin CC	Austin	MN
Austin CC	Austin	TX
Austin Peay State Univ	Clarksville	TN
Averett College	Danville	VA
Avila College	Kansas City	MO
Baldwin-Wallace College	Berea	OH
Barry University	Miami	FL
Barton College	Wilson	NC
Bates College	Lewiston	ME
Bay Path College	Longmeadow	MA
Beaver College	Glenside	PA
Becker College-Leicester	Leicester	MA
Belhaven College	Jackson	MS
Belmont Abbey College	Belmont	NC
Bennett College	Greensboro	NC
Bentley College	Waltham	MA
Berry College	Mount Berry	GA
Bethany Lutheran College	Mankato	MN
Bethel College	McKenzie	TN
Bethel College	North Newton	KS
Bethune-Cookman College	Daytona Beach	FL

Bishop Clarkson College	Omaha	NE
Bloomfield College	Bloomfield	NJ
Blue Ridge CC	Weyers Cave	VA
Bluefield College	Bluefield	VA
Boise State University	Boise	ID
Bowdoin College	Brunswick	ME
Bowling Green State Univ	Bowling Green	OH
Bradley University	Peoria	IL
Brenau College	Gainesville	GA
Brescia College	Owensboro	KY
Brunswick College	Brunswick	GA
Bucknell University	Lewisburg	PA
Burlington County College	Pemberton	NJ
Cal. Polytechnic State Univ	San Luis Obispo	CA
Cal. State Univ, Bakersfield	Bakersfield	CA
Cal. State Univ, Long Beach	Long Beach	CA
Cal. State Univ, Stanislaus	Turlock	CA
Cal. State Univ,Dominquez Hills	Carson	CA
Caldwell College	Caldwell	NJ
Caldwell CC	Hudson	NC
Calhoun State CC	Decatur	AL
Canisius College	Buffalo	NY
Cardinal Stritch College	Milwaukee	WI
Carleton College	Northfield	MN
Carlow College	Pittsburgh	PA
Carson Newman College	Jefferson City	TN
Case Western Reserve Univ	Cleveland	OH

Catawba Valley CC	Hickory	NC
Cedar Crest College	Allentown	PA
Centenary College	Hackettstown	NJ
Central Alabama CC	Alexander City	AL
Central Connecticut State Univ	New Britain	CT
Central Missouri State Univ.	Warrensburg	MO
Central Wesleyan College	Central	SC
Central Wyoming College	Riverton	WY
Chadron State College	Chadron	NE
Champlain College	Burlington	VT
Chatham College	Pittsburgh	PA
Chattahoochee Valley CC	Phenix City	AL
Chesapeake College	Wye Mills	MD
Chestnut Hill College	Philadelphia	PA
Chicago State University	Chicago	IL
Chipola Junior College	Marianna	FL
Chowan College	Murfreesboro	NC
Christendom College	Front Royal	VA
Christopher Newport College	Newport News	VA
Claflin College	Orangeburg	SC
Clarion University of PA	Clarion	PA
Clemson University	Clemson	SC
Clinch Valley College	Wise	VA
Clinton CC	Plattsburgh	NY
Clovis CC	Clovis	NM
Colgate University	Hamilton	NY
College of the Ozarks	Point Lookout	MO

College of Mount St. Vincent	Riverdale	NY
College of Notre Dame,Maryland	Baltimore	MD
College of St. Elizabeth	Morristown	NJ
College of St. Francis	Joliet	IL
College of William and Mary	Williamsburg	VA
Colorado College	Colorado Springs	CO
Colorado School of Mines	Golden	CO
Columbia Christian College	Portland	OR
Columbia College	Columbia	MO
Columbia College	Columbia	SC
Columbus College	Columbus	GA
CC of Allegheny County	Monroeville	PA
CC of Southern Nevada	North Las Vegas	NV
CC of Allegheny	West Mifflin	PA
Concordia College	St. Paul	MN
Concordia College	Portland	OR
Concordia College	Ann Arbor	MI
Concordia College	Bronxville	NY
Concordia University	River Forest	IL
Concordia University	Mequon	WI
Connecticut College	New London	CT
Converse College	Spartanburg	SC
Cornell University	Ithaca	NY
Crafton Hills College	Yucaipa	CA
Creighton University	Omaha	NE
Crowley's Ridge College	Paragoald	AR
Cumberland University	Lebanon	TN

Curry College	Milton	MA
CC of Micronesia	Kolonia,Pohnpei	FM
CUNY, Baruch College	New York	NY
CUNY, Borough of Manhattan CC	New York	NY
CUNY, Hunter College	New York	NY
D'Youville College	Buffalo	NY
Dakota Wesleyan University	Mitchell	SD
Dalton College	Dalton	GA
David Lipscomb University	Nashville	TN
Davis and Elkins College	Elkins	WV
Daytona Beach CC	Daytona Beach	FL
Delaware County CC	Media	PA
Delaware Valley College	Doylestown	PA
Delgado CC	New Orleans	LA
Denison University	Granville	OH
Diablo Valley College	Pleasant Hill	CA
Doane College	Crete	NE
Dominican College	Orangeburg	NY
Duquesne University	Pittsburgh	PA
East Arkansas CC	Forrest City	AR
East Carolina University	Greenville	NC
East Tennessee State Univ	Johnson City	TN
East Texas Baptist University	Marshall	TX
East Texas State University	Commerce	TX
Eastern Christian College	Bel Air	MD
Eastern Illinois University	Charleston	IL
Eastern Kentucky University	Richmond	KY

Eastern Mennonite College	Harrisonburg	VA
Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti	MI
Eastern New Mexico University	Portales	NM
Eastern Shore CC	Melfa	VA
Eastern Washington University	Cheney	WA
Eastfield College	Mesquite	TX
Eckerd College	St. Petersburg	FL
Edgewood College	Madison	WI
Edward Waters College	Jacksonville	FL
El Centro College	Dallas	TX
Elizabethtown College	Elizabethtown	PA
Elmhurst College	Elmhurst	IL
Emmanuel College	Boston	MA
Emory University	Atlanta	GA
Emporia State University	Emporia	KS
Erskine College	Due West	SC
Fairfield University	Fairfield	CT
Fayetteville State Univ	Fayetteville	NC
Ferris State University	Big Rapids	MI
Ferrum College	Ferrum	VA
Florida Atlantic University	Boca Raton	FL
Florida Keys CC	Key West	FL
Florida State University	Tallahassee	FL
Floyd College	Rome	GA
Fort Belknap College	Harlem	MT
Fort Bethold CC	New Town	ND
Fort Scott CC	Ft. Scott	KS

Fox Valley Technical College	Appleton	WI
Francis Marion College	Florence	SC
Franklin and Marshall College	Lancaster	PA
Franklin Pierce College	Rindge	NH
Garden City CC	Garden City	KS
Garland County CC	Hot Springs	AR
Garrett CC	McHenry	MD
Geneva College	Beaver Falls	PA
George Fox College	Newberg	OR
Georgia Southern University	Statesboro	GA
Georgia Southwestern College	Americus	GA
Georgian Court College	Lakewood	NJ
Gettysburg College	Gettysburg	PA
Glassboro State College	Glassboro	NJ
Gogebic CC	Ironwood	MI
Grambling State University	Grambling	LA
Grand Canyon University	Phoenix	AZ
Grand Valley State University	Allendale	MI
Green Mountain College	Poultney	VT
Gustavus Adolphus College	St. Peter	MN
GMI Engineering & Mgmt Inst	Flint	MI
Hagerstown Junior College	Hagerstown	MD
Hamline University	St. Paul	MN
Hampshire College	Amherst	MA
Hampton University	Hampton	VA
Harcum Junior College	Bryn Mawr	PA
Hartford State Technical Coll	Hartford	CT

Hartwick College	Oneonta	NY
Harvard University	Cambridge	MA
Hastings College	Hastings	NE
Heidelberg College	Tiffin	OH
Hesston College	Hesston	KS
Highland CC	Freeport	IL
Hilbert College	Hamburg	NY
Hill College	Hillsboro	TX
Hinds CC	Raymond	MS
Hiram College	Hiram	OH
Hocking Technical College	Nelsonville	OH
Holy Cross College	Notre Dame	IN
Holy Family College	Philadelphia	PA
Holyoke CC	Holyoke	MA
Houston Baptist University	Houston	TX
Howard College	Big Spring	TX
Hudson Valley CC	Troy	NY
Humboldt State University	Arcata	CA
Huntingdon College	Montgomery	AL
Huntington College	Huntington	IN
Huron University	Huron	SD
Hutchinson CC	Hutchinson	KS
Illinois Eastern CC	Robinson	IL
Illinois Wesleyan University	Bloomington	IL
Indiana U,Purdue U @ Fort Wayne	Fort Wayne	IN
Indiana University	Bloomington	IN
Indiana University Kokomo	Kokomo	IN

Indiana University,Southeast	New Albany	IN
Indiana Voc Tech-Wabash Valley	Terre Haute	IN
Iona College	New Rochelle	NY
Iowa State University	Ames	IA
Iowa Wesleyan College	Mt. Pleasant	IA
Irvine Valley College	Irvine	CA
Isothermal CC	Spindale	NC
Itawamba CC	Fulton	MS
Ithaca College	Ithaca	NY
Jackson CC*	Jackson	MI
Jackson State CC	Jackson	TN
Jackson State University	Jackson	MS
James Madison University	Harrisonburg	VA
James Sprunt CC	Kenansville	NC
Jamestown College	Jamestown	ND
Jefferson CC	Louisville	KY
Jefferson State CC	Birmingham	AL
John Tyler CC	Chester	VA
Johns Hopkins University	Baltimore	MD
Jordan College	Cedar Springs	MI
Judson College	Elgin	IL
Judson College	Marion	AL
Kalamazoo College	Kalamazoo	MI
Kansas Newman College	Wichita	KS
Kansas State University	Manhattan	KS
Kennesaw State College	Marietta	GA
Kent State Univ, E. Liverpool	East Liverpool	OH

Kent State Univ, Salem Campus	Salem	OH
Kent State University	Kent	OH
Kentucky Christian College	Grayson	KY
Kentucky Wesleyan College	Owensboro	KY
Kishwaukee College	Malta	IL
Knox College	Galesburg	IL
La Salle University	Philadelphia	PA
Lake Forest College	Lake Forest	IL
Lakeland College	Sheboygan	WI
Lamar University	Beaumont	TX
Lambuth University	Jackson	TN
Lander College	Greenwood	SC
Lane College	Jackson	TN
Lane CC	Eugene	OR
LaGrange College	LaGrange	GA
LaGuardia CC	Long Island City	NY
LaRoche College	Pittsburgh	PA
Lebanon Valley College	Annville	PA
Lee College	Cleveland	TN
Lees-McCrae College	Banner Elk	NC
Lehigh County CC	Schnecksville	PA
Lenior-Rhyne College	Hickory	NC
Lewis & Clark College	Portland	OR
Lewis University	Romeoville	IL
LeMoyne-Owen College	Memphis	TN
Liberty University	Lynchburg	VA
Lincoln University	Jefferson City	MO

Linfield College	McMinnville	OR
Lock Haven University of PA	Lock Haven	PA
Long Island Univ, Brooklyn	Brooklyn	NY
Long Island Univ, Brookville	Brookville	NY
Long Island Univ, C. W. Post	Brookville	NY
Long Island Univ, Southampton	Southampton	NY
Lord Fairfax CC	Middletown	VA
Los Angeles Harbor College	Wilmington	CA
Louisiana College	Pineville	LA
Loyola College, Maryland	Baltimore	MD
Loyola University	New Orleans	LA
Lycoming College	Williamsport	PA
Macalester College	St. Paul	MN
Macomb CC	Warren	MI
Madonna University	Livonia	MI
Manchester College	N.Manchester	IN
Mansfield University	Mansfield	PA
Marian College	Indianapolis	IN
Marian Court Junior College	Swampscott	MA
Marion Technical College	Marion	OH
Marist College	Poughkeepsie	NY
Marygrove College	Detroit	MI
Maryville College	Maryville	TN
Marywood College	Scranton	PA
Mater Dei College	Ogdensburg	NY
Mayland CC	Spruce Pine	NC
McPherson College	McPherson	KS

Medaille College	Buffalo	NY
Merced College	Merced	CA
Mercer University	Macon	GA
Mercyhurst College	Erie	PA
Methodist Coll of Nurs.& Health	Omaha	NE
Methodist College	Fayetteville	NC
Metropolitan State Coll, Denver	Denver	CO
Middlebury College	Middlebury	VT
Middlesex CC	Bedford	MA
Midland College	Midland	TX
Midway College	Midway	KY
Midwestern State University	Wichita Falls	TX
MidAmerica Nazarene College	Olathe	KS
Miles College	Fairfield	AL
Millersville University	Millersville	PA
Milliken University	Decatur	IL
Mills College	Oakland	CA
Milwaukee Area Technical Coll.	Milwaukee	WI
Milwaukee Sch. of Engineering	Milwaukee	WI
Minneapolis CC	Minneapolis	MN
Mississippi Univ. for Women	Columbus	MS
Mississippi Valley State Univ	Itta Bena	MS
Missouri Southern State Coll	Joplin	MO
Missouri Valley College	Marshall	MO
Mitchell College	New London	CT
Molloy College	Rockville Center	NY
Monmouth College	Monmouth	IL

Monmouth College	West Long Branch	NJ
Montclair State	Montclair	NJ
Montreat-Anderson College	Montreat	NC
Moraine Valley CC	Palos Hills	IL
Morehouse College	Atlanta	GA
Morningside College	Sioux City	IA
Morris College	Sumter	SC
Motlow State CC	Tullahoma	TN
Mount Marty College	Yankton	SD
Mount Mary College	Milwaukee	WI
Mount St. Mary's College	Emmitsburg	MD
Mount Union College	Alliance	OH
Mount Vernon Nazarene College	Mount Vernon	OH
Mt. Olive College	Mt. Olive	NC
Mt. San Antonio College	Walnut	CA
Muhlenberg College	Allentown	PA
Murray State University	Murray	KY
Nash Community College	Rocky Mount	NC
Nebraska Wesleyan Univ	Lincoln	NE
Neumann College	Aston	PA
New CC of Baltimore	Baltimore	MD
New Hampshire Technical Coll	Stratham	NH
New Hampshire Technical Coll	Manchester	NH
New Jersey Inst. of Technology	Newark	NJ
Newberry College	Newberry	SC
Niagara University	Niagara Univ	NY
Nichols College	Dudley	MA

North Carolina Central Univ	Durham	NC
North Carolina State Univ	Raleigh	NC
North Carolina Wesleyan Coll	Rocky Mount	NC
North Shore CC	Danvers	MA
Northeast CC	Norfolk	NE
Northeast Mississippi CC	Booneville	MS
Northeast Texas CC	Mt. Pleasant	TX
Northeastern Junior College	Sterling	CO
Northeastern University	Boston	MA
Northern Arizona University*	Flagstaff	AZ
Northern Illinois University	DeKalb	IL
Northern Kentucky University	Highland Hgts.	KY
Northern State University	Aberdeen	SD
Northern Wyoming CC	Sheridan	WY
Northwest MO State Univ	Maryville	MO
Northwest Nazarene College	Nampa	ID
Northwestern College	St. Paul	MN
Oakton CC	Des Plaines	IL
Ohio Northern University	Ada	OH
Ohio State University	Columbus	OH
Ohio State University,A&T Inst	Wooster	OH
Ohio State University,Mansfield	Mansfield	OH
Ohio State University,Marion	Marion	OH
Ohio State University,Newark	Newark	OH
Ohio University	Athens	OH
Ohio University-Chillicothe	Chillicothe	OH
Okla Christian Univ of Sci &Art	Oklahoma City	OK

Oklahoma Baptist University	Shawnee	OK
Oklahoma State Univ, Okmulgee	Okmulgee	OK
Old Dominion University	Norfolk	VA
Onondaga Community College	Syracuse	NY
Otero Junior College	La Junta	CO
Our Lady of the Lake Univ	San Antonio	TX
Owensboro CC	Owensboro	KY
Pacific Lutheran University	Tacoma	WA
Parks College/St. Louis Univ	Cahokia	IL
Patrick Henry CC	Martinsville	VA
Peirce Junior College	Philadelphia	PA
Pembroke State University	Pembroke	NC
Penn State, New Kensington	New Kensington	PA
Phillips County CC	Helena	AR
Piedmont Bible College	Winston Salem	NC
Pillsbury Baptist Bible Coll	Owatonna	MN
Pinebrook Junior College	Coopersburg	PA
Plymouth State College	Plymouth	NH
Pomona College	Claremont	CA
Pontifical Catholic Univ of PR	Ponce	PR
Porterville College	Porterville	CA
Prairie View A&M	Prairie View	TX
Prescott College	Prescott	AZ
Princeton University	Princeton	NJ
Quinebaug Valley CC	Danielson	CT
Ramapo College	Mahwah	NJ
Rancho Santiago CC	Santa Ana	CA

Randolph-Macon College	Ashland	VA
Ranger Junior College	Ranger	TX
Reed College	Portland	OR
Regis College	Weston	MA
Reinhardt College	Waleska	GA
Rhode Island College	Providence	RI
Rivier College	Nashua	NH
Roane State CC	Harriman	TN
Rochester Institute of Tech	Rochester	NY
Rose-Hulman Inst. of Tech	Terre Haute	IN
Roxbury CC	Boston	MA
Russell Sage College	Troy	NY
Sacramento City College	Sacramento	CA
Saddleback College	Mission Viejo	CA
Saint Francis College	Fort Wayne	IN
Saint Francis College	Brooklyn	NY
Saint Francis College	Loretto	PA
Saint Joseph's College	Windham	ME
Saint Louis University	St. Louis	MO
Saint Mary College	Leavenworth	KS
Salem CC	Carneys Point	NJ
Salem-Teikyo University	Salem	WV
Salisbury State University	Salisbury	MD
Salish Kootenai College*	Pablo	MT
Salve Regina University	Newport	RI
Samford University	Birmingham	AL
San Diego City College	San Diego	CA

San Diego Mesa College	San Diego	CA
San Jacinto College Central	Pasadena	TX
San Joaquin Delta College	Stockton	CA
Sandhills CC	Pinehurst	NC
Santa Clara University	Santa Clara	CA
Santa Rosa Junior College	Santa Rosa	CA
Sauk Valley CC	Dixon	IL
Schreiner College	Kerrville	TX
Seton Hall University	South Orange	NJ
Seton Hill College	Greensburg	PA
Seward County CC	Liberal	KS
Shawnee State University	Portsmouth	OH
Shorter College	Rome	GA
Siena Heights College	Adrian	MI
Simmons College	Boston	MA
Simpson College	Indianola	IA
Skidmore College	Saratoga Springs	NY
Snead State Junior College	Boaz	AL
South Carolina State College	Orangeburg	SC
South Central CC	New Haven	CT
South Dakota State Univ	Brookings	SD
South Florida CC	Avon Park	FL
Southeast CC	Cumberland	KY
Southeastern CC	Whiteville	NC
Southern Arkansas Univ Tech	Camden	AR
Southern Arkansas University	Magnolia	AR
Southern College of Technology	Marietta	GA

Southern Illinois U,Carbondale	Carbondale	IL
Southern Illinois U,Edwardsville	Edwardsville	IL
Southern Univ at New Orleans	New Orleans	LA
Southern Vermont College	Bennington	VT
Southwest Baptist University	Bolivar	MO
Southwest Missouri State Univ	Springfield	MO
Southwest Texas Junior College	Uvalde	TX
Southwest Texas St Univ	San Marcos	TX
Southwestern Assem of God Coll	Waxahachie	TX
Southwestern Christian College	Terrell	TX
Southwestern College	Winfield	KS
Southwestern College	Chula Vista	CA
Southwestern CC	Sylva	NC
Spartanburg Technical College	Spartanburg	SC
Spring Arbor College	Spring Arbor	MI
St. Ambrose University	Davenport	IA
St. Anselm College	Manchester	NH
St. Edward's University	Austin	TX
St. Gregory's College	Shawnee	OK
St. John Vianney College Seminary	Miami	FL
St. John's College	Santa Fe	NM
St. John's University	Collegeville	MN
St. Joseph's College	Patchogue	NY
St. Joseph's College	Brooklyn	NY
St. Lawrence University	Canton	NY
St. Louis College of Pharmacy	St. Louis	MO
St. Martin's College	Lacey	WA

St. Mary's College of MN	Winona	MN
St. Peter's College	Jersey City	NJ
Stanford University	Stanford	CA
State Fair CC	Sedalia	MO
Stephens College	Columbia	MO
Stetson University	DeLand	FL
Stillman College	Tuscaloosa	AL
Stockton State College	Pomono	NJ
Sue Bennett College	London	KY
Sweet Briar College	Sweet Briar	VA
Syracuse University	Syracuse	NY
SUNY,Brockport	Brockport	NY
SUNY,Buffalo	Buffalo	NY
SUNY,Col of Agri. & Tech.	Cobleskill	NY
SUNY,Coll.of Env. Science	Syracuse	NY
SUNY,Cortland	Cortland	NY
SUNY,Morrisville	Morrisville	NY
SUNY,Oswego	Oswego	NY
SUNY,Plattsburgh	Plattsburgh	NY
SUNY,Purchase	Purchase	NY
Tabor College	Hillsboro	KS
Tacoma CC	Tacoma	WA
Talladega College	Talladega	AL
Tallahassee CC	Tallahassee	FL
Taylor University	Upland	IN
Teikyo Westmar University	Le Mars	IA
Tennessee Technological Univ	Cookeville	TN

Texas Southmost College	Brownsville	TX
Texas State Tech Coll at Waco	Waco	TX
Texas State Tech College	Sweetwater	TX
Texas Tech University	Lubbock	TX
Texas Wesleyan University	Fort Worth	TX
The Defiance College	Defiance	OH
Three Rivers CC	Poplar Bluff	MO
Toccoa Falls College	Toccoa Falls	GA
Transylvania University	Lexington	KY
Treasure Valley CC	Ontario	OR
Trenton State College	Trenton	NJ
Trevecca Nazarene College	Nashville	TN
Tri-County CC	Murphy	NC
Trident Technical College	Charleston	SC
Trinity College	Burlington	VT
Trinity College	Washington	DC
Trinity University	San Antonio	TX
Trinity Valley CC	Athens	TX
Troy State Univ, Montgomery	Montgomery	AL
Tulane Univ,Newcomb College	New Orleans	LA
Tuskegee University	Tuskegee	AL
Tyler Junior College	Tyler	TX
Ulster CC	Stone Ridge	NY
Umpqua CC	Roseburg	OR
Union College	Schenectady	NY
Union College	Lincoln	NE
Union University	Jackson	TN

Unity College	Unity	ME
Univ. of Akron	Akron	OH
Univ. of Alabama	Tuscaloosa	AL
Univ. of Alabama, Birmingham	Birmingham	AL
Univ. of Alabama, Huntsville	Huntsville	AL
Univ. of Arkansas-Monticello	Monticello	AR
Univ. of Arkansas-Pine Bluff	Pine Bluff	AR
Univ. of California, Berkeley	Berkeley	CA
Univ. of California,Davis	Davis	CA
Univ. of Central Arkansas	Conway	AR
Univ. of Charleston	Charleston	WV
Univ. of Cincinnati	Cincinnati	OH
Univ. of CA Santa Cruz,CowellC	Santa Cruz	CA
Univ. of CA Santa Cruz,Coll 8	Santa Cruz	CA
Univ. of CA Santa Cruz,PorterC	Santa Cruz	CA
Univ. of CA Santa Cruz,Stevs.C	Santa Cruz	CA
Univ. of Delaware	Newark	DE
Univ. of Denver	Denver	CO
Univ. of Findlay	Findlay	OH
Univ. of Florida	Gainesville	FL
Univ. of Georgia	Athens	GA
Univ. of Guam	Mangilao	GU
Univ. of Hawaii, Hilo	Hilo	HI
Univ. of Hawaii, Manoa	Honolulu	HI
Univ. of Idaho	Moscow	ID
Univ. of Louisville	Louisville	KY
Univ. of Mary	Bismarck	ND

Univ. of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Belton	TX
Univ. of Maryland-College Park	College Park	MD
Univ. of Maryland,EasternShore	Princess Anne	MD
Univ. of Michigan	Ann Arbor	MI
Univ. of Minnesota, Duluth	Duluth	MN
Univ. of Minnesota, Morris	Morris	MN
Univ. of Minnesota,Crookston	Crookston	MN
Univ. of Mississippi	University	MS
Univ. of Missouri	Columbia	MO
Univ. of Missouri,Rolla	Rolla	MO
Univ. of MD-Baltimore County	Baltimore	MD
Univ. of Nevada, Reno	Reno	NV
Univ. of New Hampshire	Durham	NH
Univ. of New Mexico	Albuquerque	NM
Univ. of New Orleans	New Orleans	LA
Univ. of Notre Dame	Notre Dame	IN
Univ. of NC at Asheville	Asheville	NC
Univ. of NC at Charlotte	Charlotte	NC
Univ. of NC at Wilmington	Wilmington	NC
Univ. of Oregon	Eugene	OR
Univ. of Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	PA
Univ. of Pittsburgh,Bradford	Bradford	PA
Univ. of Pittsburgh,Johnstown	Johnstown	PA
Univ. of Portland	Portland	OR
Univ. of PR, Cayey Univ. Coll	Cayey	PR
Univ. of Redlands	Redlands	CA
Univ. of Rhode Island	Kingston	RI

Univ. of Richmond	Richmond	VA
Univ. of San Francisco	San Francisco	CA
Univ. of South Alabama	Mobile	AL
Univ. of South Carolina	Columbia	SC
Univ. of South Florida	Tampa	FL
Univ. of Southern California	Los Angeles	CA
Univ. of Southern Maine	Portland	ME
Univ. of Southwest Louisiana	Lafayette	LA
Univ. of St. Thomas	Houston	TX
Univ. of SC, Coastal Carolina	Conway	SC
Univ. of SC, Spartanburg	Spartanburg	SC
Univ. of SC, Union	Union	SC
Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville	Knoxville	TN
Univ. of Tennessee,Chattanooga	Chattanooga	TN
Univ. of West Florida	Pensacola	FL
Univ. of Wisconsin, Eau Claire	Eau Claire	WI
Univ. of Wisconsin, River Fls.	River Falls	WI
Univ. of Wisconsin, Whitewater	Whitewater	WI
Univ. of Wisconsin,Milwaukee	Milwaukee	WI
Univ. of Wisconsin,Oshkosh	Oshkosh	WI
Univ. Adventista de las Ant.	Mayaguez	PR
Universidad Interamer. de PR	Ponce	PR
Upper Iowa University	Fayette	IA
Upsala College	East Orange	NJ
Ursinus College	Ursinus College	PA
Ursuline College	Cleveland	OH
Utah State University	Logan	UT

US Coast Guard Academy	New London	CT
Valencia CC-East	Orlando	FL
Valencia CC	Orlando	FL
Valley City St Univ	Valley City	ND
Valley Forge Military Jr Coll	Wayne	PA
Vance-Granville CC	Henderson	NC
Vanderbilt University	Nashville	TN
Villa Julie College	Stevenson	MD
Virginia Highlands CC	Abingdon	VA
Virginia Intermont College	Bristol	VA
Virginia State University	Petersburg	VA
Virginia Union University	Richmond	VA
Waldorf College	Forest City	IA
Walsh College	North Canton	OH
Walter's State CC	Morristown	TN
Warner Southern College	Lake Wales	FL
Warren County CC	Washington	NJ
Washington College	Chestertown	MD
Washington University	St. Louis	MO
Wayland Baptist University	Plainview	TX
Wayne CC	Goldsboro	NC
Wayne County CC	Detroit	MI
Wayne State College	Wayne	NE
Wayne State University	Detroit	MI
Weatherford College	Weatherford	TX
Wells College	Aurora	NY
Wesley College	Dover	DE

West Chester University	West Chester	PA
West Texas State University	Canyon	TX
West Virginia State College	Institute	WV
West Virginia Univ, Parkersburg	Parkersburg	WV
Westchester CC	Valhalla	NY
Western Baptist College	Salem	OR
Western Carolina University	Cullowhee	NC
Western Illinois University	Macomb	IL
Western Maryland College	Westminster	MD
Western Michigan University	Kalamazoo	MI
Western New England College	Springfield	MA
Western Washington University*	Bellingham	WA
Western Wyoming CC	Rock Springs	WY
Westmont College	Santa Barbara	CA
Wheaton College	Norton	MA
Wheelock College	Boston	MA
Wilkes CC	Wilkesboro	NC
Wilkes University	Wilkes-Barre	PA
William Jewell College	Liberty	MO
William Paterson College	Wayne	NJ
William Penn College	Oskaloosa	IA
William Woods College	Fulton	MO
Wilson College	Chambersburg	PA
Windward CC	Kaneohe	HI
Wingate College	Wingate	NC
Woodbury University	Burbank	CA
Worthington CC	Worthington	MN

Wright State University	Dayton	OH
Wytheville CC	Wytheville	VA
Xavier University	New Orleans	LA
Yakima Valley CC	Yakima	WA
York Technical College	Rock Hill	SC

* Survey responses from these institutions were received after data analyses had begun. Therefore, they were not included in data analyses.

APPENDIX D

American Colleges and Universities

Reporting Plans for a Freshman Seminar

Beginning in the 1992-1993 Academic Year

Adrian College	Adrian	MI
American River College	Sacramento	CA
Baldwin-Wallace College	Berea	OH
Bellarmine College	Louisville	KY
Bellevue College	Bellevue	NE
Belmont University	Nashville	TN
Bluffton College	Bluffton	OH
Brigham Young University	Provo	UT
Clarke College	Newton	MS
Colorado Christian University	Lakewood	CO
Columbia Basin College	Pasco	WA
Durham Technical CC	Durham	NC
Dyersburg State CC	Dyersburg	TN
Fontbonne College	St. Louis	MO
Georgia Military College	Milledgeville	GA
Grand Rapids CC	Grand Rapids	MI

Greater Hartford CC	Hartford	CT
Guilford Technical CC	Jamestown	NC
Herkimer County CC	Herkimer	NY
Hiwassee College	Madisonville	TN
Illinois Benedictine College	Lisle	IL
Illinois State University	Norman	IL
Kauai CC	Lihue	HI
Lafayette College	Easton	PA
Lorain County CC	Elyria	OH
Loras College	Dubuque	IA
Louisburg College	Louisburg	NC
Lower Columbia College	Longview	WA
Loyola Univ Chicago	Chicago	IL
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	Buzzards Bay	MA
Massasoit CC	Brockton	MA
Montgomery County CC	Blue Bell	PA
Mount Wachusett CC	Gardner	MA
Muskegon CC	Muskegon	MI
Northland College	Ashland	WI
Notre Dame College of Ohio	South Euclid	OH
Pikes Peak CC	Colorado Sprngs	CO
Randolph-Macon College	Ashland	VA
Rollins College	Winter Park	FL

Rowan Cabarrus CC	Salisbury	NC
San Diego State Univ	San Diego	CA
Simpson College	Redding	CA
Southwestern Oklahoma St. Univ	Weatherford	OK
St. Charles County CC	St. Charles	MO
St. Mary's College	Orchard Lake	MI
St. Mary's College of MD	St. Mary's City	MD
Sterling College	Sterling	KS
Syracuse University	Syracuse	NY
SUNY,College at Old Westbury	Old Westbury	NY
Univ. of Arizona	Tucson	AZ
Univ. of Colorado	Boulder	CO
Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison	Madison	WI
Villanova University	Villanova	PA
Wagner College	Staten Island	NY
Westark CC	Fort Smith	AR
Western Baptist College	Salem	OR
Western Piedmont CC	Morganton	NC

References

American College Testing Program. (1991). *ACT institutional data file.* Iowa City: Author.

American Council on Education. (1990). *Campus trends, 1990.* Washington, DC: Author.

Appleton, J. R., & Wong, F. T. (1989). Freshman ethics course influences students' basic beliefs. *Educational Record, 70*(2), 29-31.

Association of American Colleges. (1982). *Integrity in the college curriculum.* Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, A. (1977a). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. (1977b). *Preventing students from dropping out.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25,* 297-307.

Astin, A., Green, K. G., & Korn, W. S. (1987). *The American freshman: Twenty year trends, 1966-85.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B., Goldberg, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E., & Levine, A. (1981). *A quest for common learning.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brower, A. M. (1990). Student perceptions of life-task demands as a mediator in the freshman year experience. *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience, 2*(2), 7-30.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1980). *Three thousand futures: The next twenty years for higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987). *1985-86 higher education general information survey of institutional characteristics.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Chickering, A. (1978). *Education and identity.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christie, N. G., & Dinham, S. M. (1991). Institutional and external influences on social integration during the freshman year. *Journal of Higher Education, 62,* 412-436.

Cohen, R. D., & Jody, R. (1978). *Freshman seminar: A new orientation.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Committee on the Student in Higher Education. (1968). *The student in higher education.* New Haven, CT: The Hazen Foundation.

Cuseo, J. (1991). *The freshman orientation seminar: A research-based rationale for its value, delivery, and content* (Monograph No. 4). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience.

Dwyer, J. O. (1988, July). *First year students: Pride in the past.* Paper presented at the Second International Conference on The First Year Experience, Southampton, England.

Dwyer, J. O. (1989). A historical look at the freshman year experience. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 25-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Erikson, E. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle.* New York: International Universities Press.

Fidler, P. (1991). Relationship of freshman orientation seminars to sophomore return rates. *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience, 3*(1), 7-38.

Fidler, P., & Fidler, D. S. (1991). *First national survey on freshman seminar programs: Findings, conclusions, and recommendations* (Monograph No. 6). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience.

Fidler, P., & Hunter, M. S. (1989). How seminars enhance student success. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 216-237). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fitts, C. T., & Swift, F. H. (1928). The construction of orientation courses for college freshmen. *University of California Publications in Education, 1897-1929, 2*(3), 145-250.

Freshman seminar focuses on purpose and philosophy of higher education. (1990). *The Freshman Year Experience Newsletter, 2*(4), 9.

Gaff, J. (1989, July/August). Curriculum trends for the '80s. *Change*, p. 15.

Gaff, J. (1991). *New life for the college curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, J. N. (1986a). Student affairs and academic affairs: Bridging the gap. *Carolina View, II*, 46-49.

Gardner, J. N. (1986b). The freshman year experience. *College and University, 61*, 261-274.

Gardner, J. N. (1989). Starting a freshman seminar program. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 238-249). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, V. (1989). Origins and purposes of the freshman seminar. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 183-198). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grant, G., & Riesman, D. (1978). *The perpetual dream: Reform and experiment in the American college.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gruber, S. (1990). A class act: Involving culturally diverse upperclassmen/women in the creation and implementation of a freshman program (summary). *Proceedings of the Freshman Year Experience Conference, Costa Mesa, CA, January 25-27*, 83.

Hamline University. (1990). *Bulletin, 1990-1992.* St. Paul, MN: Author

Horowitz, H. L. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Jewler, A. J. (1989). Elements of an effective seminar: The University 101 program. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 198-215). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Justiz, M., & Rendon, L. (1989). Hispanic students. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 261-276). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Kohlberg, L. (1971). Stages of moral development. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, & E. V. Sullivan (Eds.), *Moral education.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kuh, G., Schuh, J., & Whitt, E. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. (1978). *Why innovation fails.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Levine, A. (1985). *Handbook of undergraduate curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. (1989). *Shaping higher education's future: Demographic realities and opportunities, 1990-2000.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A., & Weingart, J. (1974). *Reform of undergraduate education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lincoln, Y. (1986). A future-oriented comment on the state of the profession. *Review of Higher Education, 10,* 135-142.

Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Conceptions and theories.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mayhew, L., Ford, P., & Hubbard, D. (1990). *The quest for quality: The challenge for undergraduate education in the 1990s.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, R. (1989). Freshman year enhancement in American higher education. *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience, 1*(2), 91-101.

National Endowment for the Humanities. (1984). *To reclaim a legacy.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Institute of Education. (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education.* Washington: U. S. Department of Education.

National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience. (1988). *National Survey of Freshman Seminar Programming.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina.

Neuner, J. (1990). Exploring multicultural awareness in the freshman seminar. *Proceedings of The Freshman Year Experience Conference, Costa Mesa, CA, January 25-27, 1990,* 23.

Noel, L., Levitz, R., & Saluri, D. (Eds.). (1985). *Increasing student retention: Effective programs and practices for reducing the dropout rate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pace, R. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experiences.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.

Pantages, T., & Creedon, C. (1978). Studies of college attrition: 1950-1975. *Review of Educational Research, 48,* 49-101.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1977). Patterns of student-faculty informal interaction beyond the classroom and voluntary freshman attrition. *Journal of Higher Education, 48,* 540-552.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *The effects of college on students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E., Terenzini, P., & Wolfle, L. (1986). Orientation to college and freshman year persistence/withdrawal decisions. *Journal of Higher Education, 57,* 155-175.

Perry, W. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in college.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Peterson's Guides, Inc. (1990). *Guide to four-year colleges.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Pounds, A. W. (1989). Black students. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 277-286). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rudolph, F. (1977). *Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sagaria, M. (1979). Freshman orientation courses: A framework. *Journal of NAWDAC, 43*(1), 3-7.

Sanford, N. (1969). *Where colleges fail: A study of the student as a person.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sanford, N. (1988). Foreword. In J. M. Whiteley & N. Yokota, *Character development in the freshman year and over four years of undergraduate study* (Monograph No. 1) (pp. 3-9). Columbia SC:

University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience.

Shanley, M., & Witten, C. (1990). University 101 freshman seminar course: A longitudinal study of persistence, retention, and graduation rates. *NASPA Journal, 27*, 344-352.

Siegel, B. (1989). A president's perspective on the value of freshman seminars. In M. L. Upcraft & J. N. Gardner (Eds.), *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college* (pp. 250-258). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spring, J. (1989). *The sorting machine revisited: National educational policy since 1945.* New York: Longman.

Terenzini, P., & Pascarella, E. (1977). Voluntary freshman attrition and patterns of social and academic integration in a university: A test of a conceptual model. *Research in Higher Education, 6*, 25-43.

Tinto, V. (1975). Drop-out from higher education: A theoretical perspective on recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*, 89-125.

Tinto, V. (1985). Dropping out and other forms of withdrawal from college. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, & D. Saluri (Eds.), *Increasing student retention: Effective programs and practices for reducing the dropout rate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tinto, V. (1988). Stages of student departure: Reflections on the longitudinal character of student leaving. *Journal of Higher Education, 59*, 438-445.

Upcraft, M. L., & Gardner, J. N. (Eds.). (1989). *The freshman year experience: Helping students survive and succeed in college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage* (M. Vizadon & G. Caffee, Trans.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Von Frank, J. (1985). Setting up a special program for freshmen: Mastering the politics. *College Teaching, 33*(1), 21-26

Webster's new world dictionary (3rd ed). (1988). New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Wilbur, F., & Lambert, L. (1991). *Linking America's schools and colleges.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

VITA

Betsy O. Barefoot

Birthdate: August 4, 1944

Birthplace: Goldsboro, North Carolina

Education:

1987 - 1992	The College of William and Mary Williamsburg, Virginia Doctor of Education
1985 - 1987	The College of William and Mary Williamsburg, Virginia Master of Education
1962 - 1964 1974 - 1976	Duke University Durham, North Carolina Bachelor of Arts

Professional Experience:

1989 - Present	Co-Director, National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience, University of South Carolina
1984 - 1985	Director, University of La Verne Residence Center, North Island Naval Air Station, San Diego, California
1983 - 1984	Administrative Assistant, Office of Admissions, Lambuth College, Jackson, Tennessee